HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
OLUME XXXI JULY, 1938 NUMBER 3

JEWISH LITURGICAL EXORCISM

WILFRED LAWRENCE KNOX
ORATORY OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD, CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

ROFESSOR C. H. Dodd in The Apostolic Preaching and its evelopment has drawn attention to the importance of the Kerygma" as a more or less formal statement of the Christian ospel, lying behind the earliest Christian documents; it de-rmines the structure of Mark, the speeches in Acts and the rm of the Creeds. This conventional form seems to be de-ved from Judaism. A statement of the mighty works of God creation and the history of mankind, more especially in the liverance of his people from Egypt, is a recurring feature of wish literature in the post-exilic era; perhaps the most notable ample is Ps. 136; cf. Nehemiah 9. 6 ff., Is. 63. 7 ff. Such a cital of the mighty works of God in delivering His people was viously necessary if the religion of Israel was to be changed om a primitive Semitic tribal cult into a system of monothe-m, centred on the national deity, identified with the one God Heaven; it was specially necessary to find an aetiological yth for the principal festival of the Passover. The emphasis this deliverance reflects the process by which vague legends a migration from Egypt have been conflated with the return om Babylon to form the biblical picture of the Exodus.[1]

In the N. T. this form of narrative is abundantly illustrated. he story of Genesis and Exodus is set out at length, incidents ing selected and in some cases altered, to suit the speaker's al or supposed point of view.[2] But the instances are confined

[1] For the methods in which the O. T. documents have been influenced by post-exilic ditions cf. S. A. Cook in Cambridge Ancient History III. 478 ff.

[2] For the curious variations in Stephen's speech, Acts 7. 2 ff., cf. my St. Paul and the urch of Jerusalem, 43. Paul's speech at Antioch, Acts 13. 16 ff. is another specimen; te the allusion to the hero of Benjamin, Paul's own tribe; this may rest on a remi-scence of Paul's actual method of exposition or a knowledge of general convention. pular Palestinian Judaism as represented by Peter merely gives a summary of the

to Hellenistic documents. A very interesting Jewish specimen is the narrative of the Exodus from a Hellenistic source, presumably Nicolas of Damascus, which Josephus uses in Antt. II. 16. 1 (334 ff.). Yet another is inserted at III. 5. 3. (86 ff.) in the interval provided by the faulty joining of two documents at Exod. 19. 25; for further specimens cf. Wisd. 10. 1 ff., where the narrative of Genesis and Exodus is drawn up as a story of divine salvation through the cosmic catastrophes by water and fire up to the establishment of the "kingdom" of Joseph (for the theme cf. Polybius VI. 5. 4 ff.; unfortunately the document breaks off at the Exodus before the promulgation of the Torah); Philo De Vit. Cont. 11 (83 ff., M. II, 484); and also Judith 5. 5 ff. The same theme of a narrative of the mighty works of God leading up to the Exodus and Sinai is common in the Fathers and the early liturgies.[3]

The more or less formal narrative was naturally likely to survive among the synagogues of the Dispersion and in the Church since both were concerned with missionary propaganda; Judaism in Palestine was never concerned to be a missionary religion, except where it enforced a measure of conformity on such parts of the population as it was able to conquer. But where missionary propaganda was taken seriously, a brief summary of the story of Israel was needed as an introduction to the Decalogue. The survival of this type of kerygma-form seems to throw a certain light on the well-known Jewish formula of exorcism which is included in the Paris magical papyrus (Pap. Mag. Gr. IV. 3008 ff.[4]), dated by Wessely (ap. Preisendanz Pap. Mag. Gr. 1. p. 64) as nearer 300 A.D. than 400.

In its present state the formula is an obviously composite document. It has the advantage of falling fairly simply into its component parts. After the title comes a direction for gathering and cooking herbs and reciting various spells during the process; an amulet is to be attached to the patient, and a

---

prophets. Heb. 11. 1 ff. shows the form dissolving into a general summary of the O. in which the original purpose has been forgotten.

[3] Cf. for instance Justin Martyr Dial c. Tryph. 360 b ff.; for the liturgical form cf. Lietzmann Messe u. Herrenmahl 125.

[4] The text is also printed in Deissmann, Licht vom Osten, 181 ff. (ed. 1908).

orcism uttered; the exorcism leads up to a prayer (3023 ff.) the sending of an angel to imprison the demon that is haunt- the creature whom God made in his holy paradise; the deity oked is addressed by various magic names, 3029 ff., ending h "Iael" in 3033.

This section is of interest owing to the appearance of "Jesus God of the Hebrews"; Deissmann (L. v. O. 186 n. 14) nks this is "hardly old." He is however concerned to use passage as a specimen of the kind of magic which may have ailiarized the Gentile world of Paul's day with the language the LXX. This however seems to ignore the real nature of s document, which, as I hope to show, consists mainly of gen- e Jewish elements with details of a mixed Jewish-Christian- then character. In its present form it shows the familiar flation of Jewish and heathen elements, with a somewhat e streak of Christian influence; but it is doubtful whether in ul's day the purely Jewish elements were necessarily familiar Gentile circles. As far as the allusion to Jesus the God of the brews is concerned, Nock (Gnomon 12, 607) compares the s of Sceva in Acts 19. 13, who suggest that a vague knowl- e of the efficacy of Christian exorcism would easily lead to usion of Jesus in the stock-in-trade of such practitioners rly date. I find it hard to believe that so casual an al- ion as this would have been possible much after 100 A.D. A ctitioner of magic, if he knew enough about Christianity to ert the name of Jesus, would surely have taken the trouble ind out more about Him; anyhow, the breach between Jews l Christians must have been common knowledge in the Hel- istic underworld by that date. Suetonius' casual allusion audius 25) and his complete misunderstanding cannot be ged as a parallel; official Roman circles could treat Chris- nity as beneath contempt, but it is essential in magic to cribe your deities correctly. It seems that the insertion of us in this section is of a fairly early date; it seems probable t Jesus was simply added to an existing Jewish-heathen spell which Iaeo, Iael, Iabe and allelu(ia) were already conflated h Ptah and Thoth: "Jesus" may simply have been inserted n adjuration by the God of the Hebrews (cf. Origen c. Cels. 4.

34 for this form). The rest of this section represents the commo
form of Jewish and heathen magic; herbs might be Jewis
(cf. Jos. Antt. VIII. 2. 5 (46) where the herbs of Solomon e
closed in a signet-ring effected a cure in the presence of Vesp
sian, and B. J. VII. 6. 3 (180)) but are universal; cf. Verg. Ec
8. 95 and the papyri *passim* for this aspect of magic. The offici
rabbinical attitude to such practices appears in the Baraitha
Mishnah Pesachim 4. 8. (Danby 141) where the sages commer
Hezekiah for burning the "roll of the healings" as well as t
brazen serpent; both had venerable prestige, but both savoure
of idolatry. Phylacteries are equally universal; the Jewi
phylacteries seem to represent an attempt to substitute t
words of Deut. 6. 8. interpreted in a literal sense for heath
amulets (for their use cf. II. Macc. 12. 40); the ordinary *a*
ha'aretz Jew and the Sadducees refused to wear them (cf. Ke
nedy in Hastings DB. III. 869 art. Phylacteries). In the sa
way the Mezuzoth on the door posts seem to represent a refo
of a magical Babylonian practice (Jastrow, Die Rel. Babylon
Ass. I. 285). Yet the use of amulets survived; it was even
lowed to wear an amulet of proved efficacy on the sabba
(Misnah Shabb. 8. 2. Danby 105). The concession is typical
the rabbinical attitude as it appears in Strack-Billerbeck IV
527 ff. where protection against demons is sometimes to
found in the devout practice of religion, sometimes in the use
amulets, exorcisms, etc. An interesting feature is that the
mons tremble at the name of God inscribed on the amulet; t
fear of the devils also appears in an earlier part of this papy
(line 359), with a strong LXX colouring and in Jas. 2. 19,
which Strack-Billerbeck give no rabbinical parallels.[5]

The rest falls into two main sections (3033–3045 and 304
3078) with a concluding direction (3078–end) for its use. T
first section forms a complete exorcism by the God who del
ered Israel in the cloud and pillar of fire and by the seal w
which Solomon opened the mouth of Jeremiah and made h
speak. The purpose of this exorcism is to make the devil spe

[5] This may represent a Hellenistic colouring in the Epistle of St. James; on
other hand it may be due to the disappearance of the kerygmatic form of exorcism f
orthodox Judaism in the face of Christian competition; cf. below.

comes to a perfectly good ending at 3045, and is followed by repetition of "For I adjure thee"; the remainder has no allusion to speaking. Possibly we have here an exorcism of a dumb devil"; but I am inclined to suspect that the devil is to ve his name. For this cf. the exorcism of "Legion" in Mk. 5. and Lk. 8. 30; the incident of the asking of the name is nitted by Mt. It is generally held that the story is a popular le, which somehow came to be attached to Jesus (cf. Creed, ne Gospel according to St. Luke, *ad loc.*). I am inclined to see the asking for the name a reflection of Hellenistic magic, nich Mt. has omitted as coming from an unfamiliar circle of eas.

In any case the whole formula represents on a small scale regular conformity to the kerygmatic utterance, applied to special purpose; it recounts the mighty works of God in livering His people and the power of the seal of Solomon. ne first group of incidents is significant. Demons, witchcraft, c., are powerless against water (Apuleius Metam. I. 19. 62; Jewish practice Talmud Sanh. 67b; a late (6th cent. A.D.) ristian charm quoted in Leclerq Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét. I. 04 banishes a demon across the Jordan, which he cannot re-oss). Thus it is only natural and suitable that the crossing of e Red Sea, and in the second section the Jordan, should ure largely, since they represent an act of God which not only rmed a prominent part of the kerygma of Judaism but also as peculiarly calculated to terrorize the demons; God could ing Israel dryshod through the waters which the demons uld not cross at all. The prevalence of allusions to the drown-g of the Egyptians in the Red Sea in Jewish exorcism is noted Origen c. Cels. 4. 34.

The allusion to the opening of the mouth of Jeremiah by the al of Solomon is equally appropriate in a dumb devil; I cannot ace the legend, but the historical impossibility of the story ed not prove that the source is unorthodox. Deissmann *ad* . compares Jeremiah 1. 6., no doubt rightly; anachronisms the wildest kind are perfectly possible in quite orthodox Jew-n literature. [Thus in Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews 4. 300 ebuchadnezzar is son of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba:

Ginzberg has no reference to the story implied here.] For the Jewish use of exorcisms by the names of patriarchs, kings and other righteous men cf. Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph. 311c Justin holds that such adjurations have no power, though he admits that those in the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are effective. The allusion here must be primarily to Solomon, who was the arch-enemy of demons; it may be suspected that Justin's orthodoxy is more reliable than his observation of facts. In any case we seem here to have an allusion to a Solomon-legend which has perished, peculiarly suited to open the mouth of a dumb devil or to compel a demon to utter his name, since it appealed to a supreme instance of the conquest of dumbness by the chief authority of the exorcistic world.

The end of this section seems to be taken by memory from the "Jebusites, Girgashites" (who have become χερσαῖον, land demons), and "Perizzites" who figure in the various catalogues of the inhabitants of Canaan (Gen. 15. 20). The change of Perizzites to Pharisees suggests that the papyrus has been edited by some one who knew that the Pharisees figure as the villains of the N. T. Evil spirits are naturally associated with the nations of Canaan for the Gods whom they worship are devils. The list in its present form may be an inaccurate reproduction of one of the fuller LXX lists, such as that of Gen. 15. 20. But a Jewish exorcist might be content with a selection of high-sounding names which would impress the patient even if they did not overawe the demon.

At 3045 the exorcism begins afresh with the formula "I adjure thee." The adjuration is by God who can read the heart of man, who created the earth and blesses its fruits, who is blessed by the angels. That God knows the secrets of men's hearts is sound O. T. theology, (I Sam. 16. 7 and *passim*, cf. Acts 1. 24) it is also good magic, cf. Pap. Mag. Gr. I. 175 ff.; in the Clementine Recognitions power to read the heart is a standing test of miraculous ability (2. 50 (P. G. 1. 1272) and *passim*). Naturally it is eminently suited for impressing an evil spirit which has occupied the patient's heart; it leads on to the creation of man, which thus precedes the rest of the cosmogony; the "blessing" of the fruits of the earth by God leads to the "blessing

of God by the angels with an almost rabbinical association of words rather than ideas. But the theme as a whole is well-chosen. God's power to read man's heart and His power as creator recognized by the highest order of spiritual beings are all calculated to overawe spiritual beings of an inferior class.[6]

Logically the next section might be a continuation of the preceding; it proceeds from creation to suitable incidents in history; the repetition of "I adjure thee" raises some suspicion that it is really a separate formula in view of its use later. In any case the water-motif is used in a fuller version. The historical order of events is reversed, since the crossing of the Jordan precedes the Red Sea; but possibly fresh running water is a greater obstacle to demons than the sea, and consequently the miracle of Joshua a more potent deterrent of demons than that of Moses. There follows a series of manifestations of the power of God: (1) He confused the tongues of the nations and overthrew the giants; He is praised by the heavenly powers and the wings of the Cherubim. (2) He has set bounds to the sea; the abyss feared Him and therefore the demon must hear Him. (3) He raises the winds from the four "aeons"; this is followed by a curious list of epithets. (4) The eternal fire burns before Him in the pure Jerusalem in honour of His holy name Iaeobaphrenemoun; the gehenna of fire trembles before Him; the iron melts and the mountains tremble; (5) He looks on the earth and makes its foundations tremble; He has made all things out of nothing.

Obviously there is here no sort of logical or historical order. But each of the numbers is divided from its predecessor by the formula ὁρκίζω σε. We have already seen that this formula in line 3045 suggests the conflation of two different exorcisms. Naturally if this whole section is a heathen compilation made up out of scraps of the O. T. logical order might be neglected, though it is not easy to see why the compiler should not simply have gone through the LXX selecting suitable passages for his purpose. But apart from the curious name of God in line 3072 there is nothing in the whole form which is not quite or-

[6] Cf. Pap. Mag. Gr. XII. 174 where we find a Christian insertion in a heathen spell for ensuring escape from prison; the compiler knew the tradition of the Acts.

thodox Jewish matter; it is difficult to see why a Jew should not have arranged his matter more in accordance with the O. T. tradition. I am inclined to suggest that we have here a collection of different Jewish formulae suitable for exorcism to be used at discretion, which have been conflated into one with a slight emendation at one point by a heathen who failed to see that they were not intended to be used as a single formula. This suspicion, as I shall try to show, is confirmed by certain peculiarities of the various sections.

Section (1), (lines 3056–3062) deals with the power of God as manifested in the "spiritual" world. The division of the 140 tongues (normally there are seventy; for the duplication as a means of increasing the impressiveness of the "mighty work" cf. Mt. 8, 28 and 20. 30 as against Mk. 5. 2 and 10. 46) was of course a division not merely in the human sphere; it involved the division of the rebel angels who rule the nations (Moore, Judaism 1. 227 and 278) and are presumably powerful figures in the demonic world. The "giants" come after the Tower of Babel in accordance with the general convention of Hellenistic Judaism, based on the description of Nimrod in Gen. 10. 8 (LXX) as a "giant." [7]

The destruction of the giants is contrasted with the praises offered by the heaven of heavens and the wings of the Cherubim, which in Philo Quaest. in Exod. 2. 64 ff. represents the "powers of God" who can be entirely abstract, though mildly personified, "qualities" as in rabbinical theology, but can also be the heavenly bodies or the angels of Jewish convention.

[7] They are normally conflated with the Titans (cf. Abyden. *ap.* Eus. Pr. Ev., IX 14. 1, Or. Sib. III. 98 ff.); Jos. Antt. I. 4. 2 (113 ff.) does not allude to giants, but makes Nimrod responsible for the Tower of Babel). Their destruction is usually ascribed to a great wind (Abydenus and Or. Sib. *locc. citt.*); but in Or. Sib. III. 199 they are punished in an unspecified manner by the sons of mighty Cronos. In Philo De Gigant. 13 (58 M. I. 270) the antediluvian giants of Gen. 6. 4 are associated with Nimrod and Abraham on the strength of this story, while Philo asserts in a rather controversial tone that the whole giant-story is an allegory, not a myth of the kind that heathen writers love. It seems that he has an uneasy consciousness of a tendency to conflate the Hebrew with the Orphic legend, of the type which the papyrus reveals in its statement that they were destroyed by thunderbolts. The reference to the giants is appropriate in an exorcism, since the giants are evil spirits on earth (I Enoch, 15. 8, cf. Strack-Billerbeck IV. 1. 525).

For the last meaning cf. De Plant. 4. (14 M. I. 332). Philo is lways uneasy about angels, except in so far as they can be epresented as disembodied "souls" of the Platonic type: the ppearance of the "powers" in this character seems to be due o a more conventional Jewish element in his sources.)

The next section 3063–3065 forms a separate whole; the ower of God to set bounds to the sea is again suitable to over- we demons who are afraid of water. The next section (3), which egins with "For I adjure thee" in line 3065, introduces a fur- her attribute of God, calculated to overawe the demons: He ontrols the wind, and the wind is one of the most potent forms f "spirit" (it has been noticed that a wind scatters the giants t Babel). But the "holy aeons" from which the four winds are ummoned are peculiar; apparently they are regarded as per- onal beings, who control the four quarters of the compass and he four winds which blow from them. Angels of the winds are f course common in Judaism,[8] but the description of the rulers f the four points of the compass quarters or of the earth as aeons" is not easy to parallel. It would seem that the term s derived from the aeon as the "personified representative of a egion in the stratification of the cosmos," [9] though here it is pplied not to the cosmos as stratified from the firmament ownwards but to the divisions of the earth itself. It is not lear what the source of the conception is; nor is it clear that he usage is older than 1 Clement 35. 3; the language of Eph. . 2, "according to the aeon of this world" may represent an cquaintance with the personal aeon.[10] But it seems doubtful whether the phrase represents anything more than the attempt f the author of Ephesians to follow the model of the Pauline etters as closely as possible; I am inclined to suspect that his anguage is an attempt to paraphrase the awkward "God of his world" in 2 Cor. 4. 4, with the help of Gal. 1. 4, and

[8] Jubilees 2. 2, Rev. 7. 1; the winds appear as angelic figures in the vision of Ezekiel the frescoes of the synagogue at Doura (The Excavations at Doura-Europos, Sixth eason, 356). The language of Ezekiel 37. 9 shows the conceptions of "wind" and spirit" implied in the text.

[9] Nock, A Vision of Mandulis-Aion, Harvard Theological Studies, XVII. 1. 78 ff.

[10] Cf. Nock, *loc. cit.*, and Sasse in Theol. Worterb. zum N. T., 1. 208, who admits ie possibility of this meaning here but not elsewhere in the N. T.

Ro. 12. 2 and means little more than "in accordance with the present world-age";[11] it may perhaps be suggested that this rather doubtful phrase in Eph. 2. 2, helped by v. 7, led to the use of "aeons" for the spiritual rulers of the cosmos. Possibly the four quarters of the compass are dignified with the title of "aeons" because of the popularity of the aeons in magic and the desirability of enhancing the importance of the rulers of the "spirits," — and therefore of the God who is their creator — in dealing with "spirits" of a lower order.[12]

It is possible that the four holy aeons here represent an earlier use of the same conception of the aeons than that of Ephesians, since line 3069 clearly dates to a time when the Temple was still standing (so Deissmann rightly *op. cit.* 188, n. 22). But while the reference to the Temple in section (4) must have been composed before its destruction, it need not follow that its appearance here proves that the whole document dates from so early a period. If, as I suggest, it is a conflation of separate items, the compiler might easily include the older formula referring to the Temple without being deterred by the fact that the Temple had ceased to exist; in any case the copyist of the existing document saw no reason to omit the reference. The eternal fire of the Temple at Jerusalem was eminently calculated to impress the patient, if not the demon; a convert from paganism would be particularly susceptible to the thought that he was being exorcised in the name of the God who possessed the true "undying fire" of which the fires of pagan cults were a mere imitation.[13] A pagan influence appears in the fact that the fire burns to the honour of God's holy name Iaeobaphrenemoun. This is im-

[11] The interpretation of Eph. 2. 2 depends to some extent on the view of the authorship and purpose of the Epistle. For the view implied above cf. Goodspeed, The Meaning of Ephesians, p. 3 ff.

[12] It would be tempting to see a connection between the four holy aeons and the four subordinate manifestations of the one supreme aeon identified with the sun (cf. Peterson, ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ, 241 ff.). But it is not clear that this conception, even if it can be established for a later period, has influenced early Jewish-Christian literature in its use of the term aeon for describing the spiritual rulers of the cosmos.

[13] For undying fires cf. Frazer, The Golden Bough, The Magic Art, II. 260. Philo's treatment of the fire from heaven at the first sacrifice in the Tabernacle in De Vit. Moys. 2 (3). 18, (154, M. II. 158) shows how easily the thought could be adapted to Judaism. For the need of unpolluted fire in Greek cult cf. Nilsson, Griechische Feste, 173.

possible in an orthodox Jewish formula; but the name Iao would be equally incomprehensible in an orthodox document.[14] Still it would be easy for a heathen compiler who found a reference to the fire which burnt to the holy name of God, but did not specify the name, to supply the omission and to use a form of the name Iao which appealed to him as more impressive. The original formula would have been entirely adequate if it simply ran: "I adjure thee by Him that is in the Holy Jerusalem, before whom the unquenched fire burns continually to His holy name, before whom hell trembles." Consequently it is entirely reasonable to suppose that the peculiar name emanates from the compiler. The allusion to hell as trembling before God is naturally appropriate for overawing demons.[15] Section (5) is simply an adjuration by God as Creator: if the document had been composed as a whole it must have come earlier (3075–3078).

The conclusion confirms the suspicion of a heathen compiler. The pork-tabu was widespread and would appeal to a heathen, who had no other knowledge of the details of Judaism, apart from their insistence on certain rules of ceremonial purity; the allusion to "pure men" in the last line suggests such a knowledge, which would easily be derived from Jewish missionary propaganda of the type to be found in Philo, De Vit. Moys. 2 (3) 11 (114, M. II. 152).[16] The direction for "exsuffation" is a piece of symbolical action or sympathetic magic which may be derived from the original Jewish procedure or might be part of the general stock-in-trade.[17]

[14] The name Iao and its various LXX equivalents are of course common in the papyri. But the papyri in general reveal a type of Jewish magic which is quite remote from orthodox Judaism, whereas the document we are considering is for the most part entirely orthodox.

[15] Kroll, Gott u. Hölle 475, n. 1, sees in the passage an allusion to the motif of the divine descent into hell, possibly correctly.

[16] Dieterich Abraxas 143 finds evidence for the Essenes here. Essenes are always an explanation of *ignotum par ignotius*. In any case they seem to have rejected the Temple cultus entirely (Josephus Antt. XVIII. 1. 5. (19) Philo Quod Omn. Prob. Lib. 12 (75, M. 88. 457) cf. Schürer Gesch. des jüd. Volk II. 663, n. 50. They would hardly do more than tolerate it because it was part of the Torah; its prominence in this document seems decisive against an Essene origin.

[17] Talmud Abodah Zarah quoted by Strack-Billerbeck IV, 1. 532, f. and cf. the "insufflations" of Ezek. 37. 9, John 20. 22.

In any case we have a series of exorcisms following the general type of a kerygma of Judaism, with special reference to those aspects of the action of God which are calculated to impress demons. The only curious feature is the absence of any reference to the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, a peculiarly potent spell (cf. Justin Martyr *loc. cit. sup.* and Origen c. Cels. 4. 33 and 5. 45), whose absence is hard to explain.[18] The basis of it appears to be entirely orthodox Jewish practice of the kind which we might expect in orthodox Jewish synagogues in Alexandria; it is Judaism coloured by a slight veneer of Hellenism; roughly it resembles Philo in his least hellenized moments. It is strikingly free from the popular magic which appears in rabbinical Judaism. This is not unnatural; for rabbinical Judaism was never seriously concerned with the danger of a relapse into idolatry and could therefore tolerate a measure of popular superstition which the official Judaism of the Alexandrine synagogues had to reject at all costs.[19] Naturally there was, as the papyri show, a Jewish magic which was less scrupulous. Here we seem to have a series of liturgical exorcisms which were intended to effect their purpose without endangering the loyalty of the exorcist of the patient to the religion of the Bible.

Although Deissmann is no doubt right in thinking that Jewish magic had familiarized the Gentile world with the Jewish names of God, I am inclined to doubt whether this particular form is likely to have been widely used in magical circles as early as the date of Paul's visit to Ephesus. It seems to be a perfectly genuine liturgical exorcism, which would be used in the first instance for Jews, proselytes and worshippers in the

[18] Origen (c. Cels. 4. 33) says that the words are so potent that they are used not only by Jews but by all sorts of magicians; the papyri confirm him abundantly. Is it conceivable that the document under consideration is a deliberate attempt to provide a substitute for them on account of their heathen associations?

[19] McGown, The Testament of Solomon, 93 ff. points out that Solomon disappears from Jewish magic from Talmudic times until the Middle Ages. I suspect that the Baraitha quoted above represents a suppression of the mixed form of Kerygmatic Exorcism and pure magic which appears in lines 3008–3045. If so, it is later than Josephus and had not become fully effective outside Palestine in the time of Justin Martyr and Origen. I am inclined to suggest that its abandonment was due to Christian criticism and Christian competition.

synagogue. Its appearance in the magical papyri seems to represent a final stage of decline in the world; exorcism in itself cannot justly be regarded as a branch of magic, except on the assumption that the ancient world ought to have possessed a scientific knowledge of psychology.

ARISTOTLE AND THE JEWISH SAGE ACCORDING TO CLEARCHUS OF SOLI

HANS LEWY

The Hebrew University, Jerusalem

I

AMONG the Greek documents concerning Jews the tale told by Josephus in the name of Clearchus of Soli deserves special attention.[1] This account, in which Clearchus describes the meeting of his master Aristotle with a Jewish sage, contains not only the earliest information about personal acquaintance between Greek and a Jew, but also raises general interest by the personality of the Western representative. Josephus has omitted a report upon the subject of their discourse, although it would have been worth while to relate the words exchanged between the "maestro di color' che sanno" and one of the ἐκλεκτοὶ πιστοὶ Ἑβραῖοι.

The account of Clearchus has been much more quoted than dealt with critically.[2] It is to be found in the first book of Josephus' polemic treatise against Apion (I 177–181). Josephus borrowed his quotation from the first book of the work of Clearchus of Soli, entitled 'concerning sleep' (περὶ ὕπνου), which, as the outward form shows, reproduced a dialogue between Aristotle and his pupils on this theme. Josephus cites without further introduction a section of Aristotle's talk which literally translated runs as follows:

"(177) Yet it would be too long to deal with this fully:

[1] The document of Clearchus (FHG II, 323, frg. 63 Mueller), with a short commentary, may be found in Th. Reinach, Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judaïsme (Paris, 1895), 10 ff. Cf. Flavius Josèphe contre Apion, texte établi et annoté par Th. Reinach (Paris, 1930), 34 f.

[2] Above all, the excellent commentary of Gutschmid published after his death and containing explanatory notes to c. Ap. I, 1–185, Kleine Schriften (Leipzig, 1893), IV, 1 ff., is to be mentioned, which will remain the basis for every critical treatment of Josephus' treatise against Apion. E. Silberschlag, The earliest record of Jews in Asia Minor, JBL (1933), 66–77, is mainly concerned with refuting older views on the genuineness of the fragment of Clearchus in Josephus, but hardly contributes anything new to its understanding.

but what reveals in him certain gifts of magic and love of wisdom in a like manner,[3] may not be amiss to discuss. Now, that I may be plain with you, Hyperochides, I shall seem to tell you wonders which resemble only dreams.[4] Hereupon Hyperochides replied modestly: For that very reason all of us are desirous of hearing thereof. (178) Then replied Aristotle: For this cause it will be best to follow the precepts of the rhetoricians and first to give an account of this man's nation, that so we may not disobey the experts on description.[5] Then said Hyperochides: Go on, if it so please you. (179) This man then, answered Aristotle, was by birth a Jew and came from Coelesyria.[6] This race has its origin in the philosophers who live among the Indians. The philosophers are named by the Indians as it is said, Calani and by the Syrians Judaei, taking their name from the country they inhabit; for it is called Judaea. But the name of their city is a very awkward one, for they call it Jerusaleme.[7] (180) Now this man, being acquainted with many people [8] and coming down from time to time from the highlands to the districts near the sea, was a Greek, not only in language, but also in soul. (181) When we ourselves happened then to be in Asia Minor, this man chanced to come to the same places, and, meeting us and some other scholars, made trial of our wisdom; and after he had become (more) intimate with many learned men, he communicated to us rather more of such things as he knew himself.

[3] See notes 13 and 85.

[4] See note 14.

[5] Gutschmid illustrates this rule by adducing Isocrates Euagoras 12: Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν περὶ τῆς φύσεως τῆς Εὐαγόρου καὶ τίνων ἦν ἀπόγονος . . . δοκεῖ μοι πρέπειν . . διελθεῖν. Ἀπαγγελία denotes 'describing'; cf. Plato, Rep. 394 C; Aristot., poet. 5. 1449 b 11. 6. 1449 b 26.

[6] Coelesyria was the Greek name of the former Persian satrapy 'Abarnahara' which embraced the whole of Syria and Palestine. Cf. Theophrastus hist. plant. I. 6, 2, 5. U. Kahrstedt, Syrische Territorien in hellenistischer Zeit, Abhdlg. Goettinger N. F. XIX, 2 (1926), 6. 20 f.

[7] Ἱερουσαλήμη (Laur.), 'sicher die ächte Lesart Klearchs,' Gutschmid, 1584. The singular form shows that Clearchus was not yet acquainted with the Grecized form Ἱεροσόλυμα, which, in Greek literature, occurs at first in Hecataeus (Jos. c. Ap. I. 197).

[8] ἐπιξενούμενος πολλοῖς, literally 'accepted by many as guest.' Gutschmid quotes well Demosth. ad Polycl., 56, 1224. Aristot., Polit. VII, 6. 1327 a 13.

This is Aristotle's account of the matter as given us by learchus."

First a few words about the locality of the meeting. Aristotle entions that he dwelt at that time in Asia Minor. The date nd purpose of this sojourn are known.[9] After Plato's death 347 B.C.), Aristotle left the Academy in order to accept the in-tation of Hermias, the ruler of the town of Atarneus (in the roas). This Hermias, following the desire of some of Plato's pils who helped him in carrying out his political reforms, had unded a sort of branch of the Athenian Academy at Assos, on ie southern coast of the Troas. Aristotle lectured there for ree years to this group. The Aristotle of Clearchus appar-ntly professes to describe an event which happened while he as staying in this milieu. Accordingly, the meeting with the w would have taken place in North-Western Asia Minor,[10] obably at Assos itself,[11] because several scholars are men-oned as being present at the debate.[12]

What was the subject of their discussion? Josephus does not ll anything about it; his quotation breaks off too soon. He serts that he has made the citation only to prove that the reeks were acquainted with educated Jews as early as Aris-tle's time (c. Ap. I 175), and to refute thereby Apion's asser-on that they were a young and uncivilized race. Therefore he as interested only in a literal reproduction of just those

[9] For the following cf. W. Jaeger, Aristotle, 111 ff.

[10] So already Gutschmid, Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alten Orients (Leipzig, 6), 77, 1. Kl. Schr., IV, 586.

[11] I formerly thought that with the highlands mentioned by Clearchus the hills of extending to the northeast of Assos were meant, but the objections of Professor ck have induced me to give up this view. I think it worth while to quote his argu-nts: "The quotation begins with remarks about Palestine which I interpret as mean-that he came down from the hilly country of Judea to the Greek cities of the enician coast line. The reference to his meeting with Aristotle implies that as a velled man he happened to pay a visit to the coast line of Asia Minor. I do not see y a legend should postulate a Jew at this time regularly resident in the hinterland of a Minor. On the other hand, all these legendary Oriental travellers were liable to ke extensive journeys."

[12] Jaeger, in the English edition of his Aristotle, 116, quotes the passage of Clearchus estimony, "that there had been a time when Aristotle was teaching in Asia Minor ether with other Platonists, and that can only have been the time when he was ching in Assos."

phrases which characterized the meeting as well as the origin and the mind of the Jew. In his subsequent remarks (I 183) he added briefly that Clearchus spoke about the Jew only 'by way of digression' (*ἐν παρεκβάσει*), because 'his main design was of another nature.'

Some allusions in what is preserved of the dialogue give an indication of the nature of the meeting. Aristotle praises the prodigious qualities (*θαυμασιότης*) and 'love of wisdom' (*φιλοσοφία*)[13] of his Jewish companion and declares that he has learned from him 'something miraculous which resembles only dreams.'[14] By these words the approximate direction in which we are to seek for the subject of this colloquy is indicated.

Some other fragments are preserved from Clearchus' work one of which throws light upon the mystery surrounding the procedure of the meeting between Aristotle and the Jew. The Neoplatonist Proclus in his commentary on the myth of Plato's Republic quotes another passage from Clearchus' book on sleep.[15] We are told here that Aristotle became acquainted with a man who knew how to draw out the soul from the body of a sleeping boy with the help of a magic wand. Clearchus describes the experiment in the following words:[16] "He stru

[13] *θαυμασιότητά τινα καὶ φιλοσοφίαν* can hardly have been explained, as Gutschmid, 579 proposed, as hendiadys like *θαυμάσιόν τινα φιλοσοφίαν*. *θαυμασιότης* stands by itself and denotes the miraculous qualities of the man, as the additional *τις* proves, while emphasizes the irrationality of his virtues. In § 182 *πολλὴν καὶ θαυμάσιον καρτερίαν*, the adjective *θαυμάσιος* has also maintained its original signification. See note 83.

[14] Gutschmid, 580 f., has made the fine suggestion that the words *θαυμαστόν, ὀνείρ ἴσα σοι δόξω λέγειν* are arranged in a rhythmical order and can easily be changed i an iambic trimeter (*θαυμαστ' ὀνείροις σοι δόξω λέγειν ἴσα*), which perhaps is taken fr a tragedy or comedy.

[15] Proclus in Platonis rempubl. comment. II, 122, 22 sq. Kroll. On the other fra ment of Clearchus preserved by Proclus, II, 113, 22 sq. Kroll, see E. Rohde, Klei Schriften (Tuebingen, 1901), II, 179 ff.

[16] Proclus, l.c., *Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἐξιέναι τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ εἰσιέναι δυνατὸν εἰς τὸ σῶμα, δηλ καὶ ὁ παρὰ τῷ Κλεάρχῳ τῇ ψυχουλκῷ ῥάβδῳ χρησάμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ μειρακίου τοῦ καθεύδοντ καὶ πείσας τὸν δαιμόνιον Ἀριστοτέλη, καθάπερ ὁ Κλέαρχος ἐν τοῖς περὶ ὕπνου φησίν, π τῆς ψυχῆς, ὡς ἄρα χωρίζεται τοῦ σώματος καὶ ὡς εἴσεισιν εἰς τὸ σῶμα καὶ ὡς χρῆται αὐ οἷον καταγωγίῳ· τῇ γὰρ ῥάβδῳ πλήξας τὸν παῖδα τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξείλκυσεν καὶ οἷον ἄγε δι' αὐτῆς πόρρω τοῦ σώματος ἀκίνητον ἐνέδειξε τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἀβλαβὲς σῳζόμενον ἀναισθητ πρὸς <τὰς πληγὰς τῶν γναπτόν- [restituit Bernays]>-των ὅμοιον ἀψύχῳ· ἐκείνην μεταξὺ διενεχθεῖσαν πόρρω τοῦ σώματος ἐγγύθεν αὐτῆς ἀγομένης πάλιν <ὑπὸ> τ ῥάβδου μετὰ τὴν εἴσοδον ἀπαγγέλλειν ἕκαστα. Τοιγαροῦν ἐκ τούτων πιστεῦσαι τοὺς*

he boy with the wand, drew out his soul, and, so to speak, uided it from the body with the wand, afterwards showing hat the body was all the time lying motionless and undamaged, nd that it remained insensible to the blows like a corpse.[17] he soul had meanwhile departed from the body: after having een led back to the body with the help of the wand, after en- ering, it told all (what it had seen).[18] This experiment con- inced all the other spectators as well as Aristotle that the soul ould separate itself from the body." [19]

Two scholars, Havet and Gutschmid,[20] have already made he suggestion that this unnamed magician might be identical ith the Jew of Clearchus. There are several indications which oint to this supposition. Aristotle, in the passage quoted by osephus, praises the Jew's magic gifts and promises to tell ex- raordinary things about his meeting with him. Both facts pply also to the miracle worker of Proclus. Further, Aristotle xtols in Josephus the philosophical knowledge of the Jew, hich showed itself in several conversations about speculative uestions. The nature of one of these talks, which is the most elevant for our present purpose, can be determined. The dis- ourse recorded by Clearchus dealt with sleep, and the choice of is theme is not merely fortuitous in a pupil of Aristotle. The ct that the soul, freed from the body, continues its individual xistence and is able to display clairvoyant faculties, was in the yes of Plato and of Aristotle in his younger days a proof of its nmortality.[21] The question, if and when it could separate it-

---

λους τῆς τοιαύτης ἱστορίας θεατὰς καὶ τὸν Ἀριστοτέλην χωριστὴν εἶναι τοῦ σώματος τὴν χήν.

[17] The commentary of Proclus is preserved only in one Ms. (a Laurentianus) which s become unreadable in many places. The first deciphering and elucidation of the ove passage is due to Bernays, who in the notes to his admirable Zwei Abhandlungen ber die aristotelische Theorie des Dramas (Berlin, 1880), 90 was the first to point to importance.

[18] Cf. Plato, Rep. 614 b 7, ἀναβιοὺς δ' ἔλεγεν ἃ ἐκεῖ ἴδοι. See note 39.

[19] As in the tale preserved by Josephus, so also in the passage quoted by Proclus, istotle appears surrounded by many friends: it is they who, on the hypnotist's re- est (see ἐνέδειξε), persuade themselves by beating (τῶν γναπτόντων, only the final llable των of the verb can be read with certainty) of the body's insensibility.

[20] E. Havet, Mémoire sur la date des écrits de Bérose et de Manéthon (Paris 1873), . Gutschmid, 587.

[21] Jaeger, 162 f.

self from the body, became a fundamental problem of theology for the older Plato and led to intensified enquiries into occult phenomena. Sleep as one of the conditions in which the soul "assumed its own form," [22] and its activity in this state, grew to be a subject of investigation in the Academy. The last sentence of the fragment preserved by Proclus shows, that the Aristotle of Clearchus started from this point of view in debating about the problem: *εἰ χωριστὴ ἡ ψυχή*. Therefore, one may infer that the same question was at issue between Aristotle and the Jew, and that the man answered in the affirmative, and at last convinced (cf. *πείσας*) the questioners by his experiment with the sleeping boy.[23]

The conduct of the mysterious hypnotist and his method of reasoning, not to mention his education, are in striking contradiction to the usual conceptions of Jews who lived in the fourth century B.C. (only a hundred years after Ezra), or even of members of the Jewish diaspora in which special developments may have occurred.[24] If the thaumaturge and the Jew mentioned by Josephus really are, as we think, one and the same, then Clearchus must have put into his mouth alien views. The source of these ideas becomes intelligible, if we turn to examine Clearchus' opinions about the origin of the Jewish race. They are in his opinion descendants of the Indian philosophers, who in their own country are called Calani and in Syria Jews. These Calani are a product of phantasy. Calanus was in reality one of the Indian Gymnosophists (who were erroneously counted among the Brahmans by the Greeks). He stayed in the camp of Alexander the Great and, by his ascetic piety and especially by his public self-cremation, according to indigenous rites, made a deep impression upon the assembled army.[25] Clearchus called all Gymnosophists Calani after him.[26] Their teachings seemed

[22] *τὴν ἴδιον ἀπολαβοῦσα φύσιν*, Aristotle, frg. 10 Rose; Jaeger, 161 f.

[23] The words *ὀνείροις ἴσα* (see note 14) recall the famous Homeric verse *ψυχὴ δ' ἠύτε ὄνειρος ἀποπταμένη πεπότηται*. By this allusion too, Aristotle's pupils are prepared to hear of a miracle concerning the soul.

[24] Gutschmid, 588, refers to Lev. 19, 26 (Dtn. 18, 10), prohibition of sorcery; cf. also Orac. Sib. III, 225. The remarks of later writers about Jewish sorcerers cannot be applied to this period.

[25] Re s.v. Kalanos (the passage of Clearchus is missing there).

[26] Cf. H. Lewy in ZNTW 31 (1932), 125 f.

the Greeks to be related to those of other religious communies of the Orient, which to Western eyes still dazzled by the ofusion of sects they found there, appeared as a widespread nity. In another work Clearchus affirmed that the Gymnophists were descendants of the Magi, i.e. of the Zoroastrian riests.[27] Thereby the Jews became indirect descendants from e caste of the Persian clergy, and through this connection the inion of Clearchus concerning the prodigious qualities of the w unfolds itself. The Magi were generally held by the Greeks be wise men believing in the immortality of the soul and ssessing mantic gifts.[28] Both these qualities are quite applicae to the Jew whom we have identified with the thaumaturge. Another argument supporting the identity of the two figures n be brought forward. Josephus, like Proclus, gives an inmplete account. Josephus omits, as we saw, the subject of e discourse. His silence is due not only to the reasons he gives; is much more generous in his quotations if pro-Jewish views e in question.[29] It becomes intelligible at once if we suppose at in the suppressed part of Clearchus' dialogue the hypnotic ts of a Jew were described. By the reproduction of this scene sephus would have appeared ridiculous to the enlightened eeks for whom his book was written,[30] and odious to the Jews om he set himself to defend.

But Proclus' quotation likewise is not complete. He introces the miracle-worker without name and without any further scription.[31] Yet such an anonymous treatment is contrary to e nature of miracle tales. Events like these could be considd trustworthy only if they were accurately attested, and if e personality of the wizard received a detailed characteriza-

[27] Diog. Laert. I, prol. 9, Κλέαρχος δὲ ὁ Σολεὺς ἐν τῷ περὶ παιδείας καὶ τοὺς γυμνοσοφιστὰς ἀπογόνους εἶναι τῶν μάγων φησίν.

[28] Re s.v. Mageia (Hopfner) and Magoi (Clemen). It may suffice to refer to Theopompus 115 F 64 Jac.

[29] Gutschmid, 587, rightly remarks that the striking reticence of Josephus in quoting Clearchus arouses suspicion. Later on, Josephus cites, at full length, Hecataeus' story of the archer Mosolammus, in which, just as in the tale of Clearchus, the intellectual superiority of a Jew to the Greeks is praised. See my article quoted in note 26.

[30] Porphyry, de abst. IV, 11 quotes the work with the title πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας.

[31] See note 35.

tion.[32] In miracle tales of a similar type, mentioned by Proclus in the same chapter, the name of the person and the scene of the event are always noted precisely; the detailed introduction of Aristotle in Clearchus as preserved by Josephus, serves the same purpose. Accordingly, Proclus had apparently special reasons for concealing the origin and name of the wonder worker. He lived in an epoch in which the teachings of Judaism, through the victory of the church, had become a matter exciting the strongest resentment in a convinced pagan such as he. His aversion for the monotheistic religions, which he shared with the other Neoplatonists of the Athenian school, caused him to grudge the Jew the honor of meeting his 'divine' [33] Aristotle.[34] Consequently, he preferred an anonymous introduction.[35]

In reply to the general hypothesis here advanced, a critic might ask: What, after all, influenced Clearchus to choose a Jew for his purpose? For it seems that he had in mind a personality of quite a peculiar stamp and aimed at describing a special event. He depicts a man who became familiar with friends of Aristotle, carried on philosophical discussions with them, and was accepted as being "a Grecian not only in lan-

[32] Cf. from this point of view the many examples of wonder-stories collected by Wendland, Antike Geister- und Gespenstergeschichten. Festschrift z. Jahrhundertfeier d. Universitaet Breslau (1911), 33–55. See also Rohde, Kl. Schr. II, 184 f.

[33] Proclus, in the passage quoted note 16, calls him τὸν δαιμόνιον Ἀριστοτέλη, so often; see e.g. in Plat. Tim. comm. I, p. 6, 22 ed. Diehl.

[34] Proclus in his works consistently avoids any mention of Jews or Christians and any biblical quotations. This silence was in his age (the fifth century of our era) the last possible form of opposition to the victorious Church. The same principle was followed by all Neoplatonists of the Athenian school till its close (a. 529 A.D.). Veiled anti-Christian polemic is found in Proclus' works by Wilamowitz, Die Hymnen des Proklos, etc., Sitzungsber. Berlin (1907), 276 and E. R. Dodds, Proclus, The Elements of Theology (Oxford, 1933), p. xxviii, n. 4. Under the pressure of Christian zealots Proclus was compelled to leave Athens for one year (Marinus XV).

[35] Proclus signified the thaumaturge according to his action as ὁ τῇ ψυχουλκῷ ῥάβδῳ χρησάμενος. The adjective does not seem to have been used before; ψυχουλκέομαι denotes III Macc. 5, 25 'to be dying'; ψυχουλκός was the name of a plant, Hesych. Accordingly, Proclus replaced the original description of Clearchus by a word of his own coining. It recurs in the same work, p. 121, 11 Kroll, in connection with αἷμα (Odysseus' sacrifice in the underworld, λ 26), and was probably formed on the analogy of the epitheta of Hermes ψυχοπομπός, ψυχαγωγός, χρυσόρραπις who, with his staff, conducted the souls of the dead and brought sleep and dreams; Odyssey ω 2 ff., Virgil Aen. IV, 242 ff.

ıage, but also in soul." How does this fit into a picture of a izard who experiments with hypnotic tricks and whose be- ıvior contradicts all the usual views concerning Jews and ıdaism of his time?

This contradiction loses its significance if we investigate more recisely the literary intentions of Clearchus. Let us take his lvice and examine the genre of his book "according to the ecepts of the rhetoricians." Clearchus quoted his story about ıe Jew in a dialogue, in which the master appeared in the circle his pupils, and discussed fundamental problems of Meta- ıysics. His literary models were Plato and Aristotle himself, ho in his youth had composed dialogues in the Platonic style, hich were distinguished from their prototypes only in their anner of presenting the dispute. In the Aristotelian dialogue, particular theme settled upon in the beginning was dealt with roughout the dialogue. The master undertook the guidance the discussion and the participants voiced their opinions in herent speeches.[36] Clearchus' treatise on sleep was such a alogue, according to the Platonic model, but slightly changed *Aristotelio more*.' In the few lines, quoted literally by Josephus, is literary intention can still be discerned. Aristotle is sur- unded by pupils who listen to him with respect (177 *εὐλα- ύμενος*). He begins his tale with a literary reminiscence[37] and deavors to speak in the ironical manner[38] which is so familiar the style of Socrates.[39] Moreover the precise model of earchus can be determined. Aristotle announces with mys- rious words that he is about to tell something extraordinary, ıd increases the tension in his audience by a lengthy preamble ıout the personality of the strange foreigner to whom he is debted for his knowledge. This recalls the introduction to

[36] On the literary form of the Aristotelian dialogue see Jaeger, 27 ff.

[37] See note 14.

[38] Cf. the ironical reference to the rules of the rhetoricians, note 5.

[39] Gutschmid, 580, has already noted some resemblances to the style of Plato's logue, but did not realize Clearchus' literary intentions. For *οὐ χεῖρον* (177) cf. to Phaedo 105 a 5f. (a formula of transition familiar also to Aristotle, e.g. Polit. 6 b 38, Eth. Nicom. 1127 a 14). For the first sentence cf. for instance Plato, p. 615 a 4 f., *τὰ μὲν οὖν πολλά, ὦ Γλαύκων, πολλοῦ χρόνου διηγήσασθαι · τὸ δ' οὖν άλαιον ἔφη τόδε εἶναι. . . .*

the myth of Plato's Republic, where the miraculous tale is told about Er, the son of Armenius, who, after being severely wounded in the fight and thought to be dead, suddenly came back to life after twelve days, when his body had already been put on the pyre, and told of the wandering of his soul through the other world during the time of its removal from the body. Both in Plato and Clearchus, the account of the miraculous happenings to the soul during its separation from the body is put into the mouth of a 'barbarian.' [40]

The myth in the tenth book of Plato's Republic inaugurated a new species of ancient literature.[41] There arose a special series of dialogues, in which famous teachers of wisdom appeared and communicated strange occurrences, fables and myths, as proofs of the mysterious self-existence of the soul. Many Platonists wrote such dialogues περὶ ψυχῆς, in which "the ascetic mood and supernatural tendency to the soul's separation from reality," [42] that characterize the philosophy of the older Plato and the younger Aristotle, found their expression.[43] One of the most successful works of this kind was the account given by Plato's pupil Heraclides Ponticus of a certain Empedotimos' ascent to heaven, in which adventure he saw the dwelling place of the souls in the Milky Way.[44] In another dialogue by the same author, the miracle priest Abaris asked Pythagoras to recount what happened on his voyage to Hades.[45] In a third work of Heraclides, which bears the title "Concerning Apparent Death" (περὶ τῆς ἄπνου), Empedocles tells his friend Pausanias of the resuscitation of a dead maiden, whereupon there follows

[40] Cf. also note 18.

[41] Hirzel, Der Dialog (Leipzig, 1895), I, 334 f., has collected the majority of the examples adduced in what follows. See Wilamowitz, Platon I, 392, 2.

[42] Rohde, Psyche [5] II, 296, 1.

[43] This inclination to transcendental speculation links the pupils of the older Plato to the Neoplatonists, to whom we owe the majority of the fragments of this species of literature. Proclus for example, in his commentary on the myth of Plato's Republic, has preserved a series of tales about the resurrection of men taken for dead; among them, two quotations from Clearchus (about the second, see note 15) as proof that the soul could leave the body and return to it again.

[44] Rohde II, 94, 1. Re s. Herakleides no. 45, 18. Wilamowitz, Glaube der Hellenen, II, 533 ff.

[45] Rohde, II, 91 and 418.

s in Clearchus' dialogue, a discursive discourse on the physiological possibilities of apparent death.[46]

The theological discourses of Plutarch, who counted himself among the Academicians, were composed under the influence of these dialogues of the Platonists. The three famous myths which form the end of his eschatological treatises, are, as regards content, dependent on Plato's myths in the Phaedo and the Republic, and in style also tend to show the influence of the Platonic writers of dialogues.[47] In the introduction of one of these myths,[48] Plutarch relates the tale of the immoral Thespesius of Soli, who fell down from a hill and was taken for dead, but revived three days afterwards during his burial, repented and changed his habits. When asked the reasons for his change of heart, he reported that his soul had seen the sinners' torments in Hades during its separation from the body, and that his sight was a warning to him. Rohde thought this account borrowed[49] from Thespesius' fellow-townsman Clearchus, at any rate, it forms an interesting parallel to his manner of writing.[50] The Jew of Clearchus, whom we have ventured to identify with the thaumaturge of Proclus, is to be enrolled among the figures of this type of dialogue.

II

The myths included in the dialogues mentioned above — with the important exception of Plato's — are distinguished

[46] Re s. Herakleides no. 45, 23. His tale that the soul of Hermotimos left the body for many years, and after having returned from its ecstatic voyage, brought back with mantic insight into the future, was famous; Rohde II, 94 f. Similarly, Epimenides' sleep in the cavern and his ecstasies were taken as proof "that the soul could leave the body as much as it liked, and return to it"; Rohde II, 96, 4. Another instance was the ecstasy of the miracle worker Aristeas of Proconnesus; Rohde II, 91 ff. The two latter examples were mentioned by Proclus as parallels to the myth of the Platonic Er.

[47] In particular, as Heinze, Xenokrates (Leipzig, 1892), has proved, by Plato's pupil Xenocrates, who was to become 'der eigentliche Vater des hellenischen Geister- und Teufelspukes,' Wilamowitz, Platon I, 719.

[48] De sera numinis vindicta c. 22 sq. (563 sq.).

[49] Rohde, Kl. Schriften II, 180, 5, Psyche II, 94, 1.

[50] Plutarch in his dialogue de facie in orbe lunae c. 26, 2 introduces the hero of his myth as Aristotle did his Jew: *ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ὑποκριτής εἰμι, πρότερον δὲ αὐτοῦ φράσω τὸν ἑταῖρον αὐτοῦ.*

from Clearchus' tale by the fact, that the revelations of the experiences of the soul during its separation from the body are given by Greeks and not by 'Barbarians.' This peculiarity in Clearchus' dialogue which is emphasized by the detailed characterization of the Jew, seems, in spite of all the doubts hitherto expressed, to support belief in the historical reality of this figure. Another difference is that while the rest of the narrators of myths report only experiences which had happened to others, here a man appears who himself performs deeds which are of the order of myths. Thus his action, as well as his non-Greek origin, distinguishes the Jew from the other figures of the same literary type. It can be shown that these peculiarities too take their origin from certain literary tendencies.

It has already been remarked that Clearchus himself held peculiar views about the origin of the Jews, which were developed from the erroneous conceptions of his contemporaries. Further, it is remarkable that the Jew is introduced by Aristotle with additional 'pathos,' as not only equal to the Greeks in language and mind, but also superior in power of thought and knowledge. This esteem corresponded to the general bias of many educated Greeks of his time in favor of Oriental wisdom and its representatives, which also favorably influenced their opinion of the Jews. This pro-Oriental tendency was already in evidence during Plato's last period, and passed from the master to his pupils, one of whom was the younger Aristotle.[51] Knowledge of the castes of Oriental priests and their teachings was sensibly enriched by the conquests of Alexander, who made accessible the countries of the East. To the Egyptian priests, the Babylonian Chaldaeans, and Persian Magi, there were added the priestly caste of the Brahmans, living in remote India, and the Jews, who had been situated far away from the high road of world history.[52] The views which the participants in Alexan-

[51] The interest of the Academy was attracted by two doctrines which seemed to verify the fundamental principles of their own philosophy: The Chaldaean dogma of the divine nature of the celestial spheres and the religious dualism of the Persian Magi. Jaeger, Aristotle 131 ff.

[52] Alexander the Great did not enter Jerusalem on his campaigns (the tale of his meeting with the High Priest of the Holy City is a pious legend). The military and commercial roads of Palestine run along the coast, where the fortified cities Acco, Jaffa

er's campaigns brought home about the peculiarities of the ewish people were, unlike those about India, confused, be- use they were not based on the accounts of eyewitnesses. onsequently, those writers who dealt with customs and sci- ices, and whose interest was attracted by the existence of a ew caste of priests, proceeded to fill up the meager reports by nsubstantiated hypotheses. Apparently they had only heard bout the worship of Jerusalem, her priesthood and sanctuary; heir knowledge of the constitution of the people was limited to he fact that Judaea formed a temple state with the High riest as political head and official representative. Thus they ferred that the Jews were not at all a distinct race, but a body priests, whose relation to the nation of Syrians, was like that the Magi to the Persians and that of the Brahmans to the ndians.[53] In accordance with the high esteem, in which the isdom of these priestly castes [54] was held, they believed also hat the Jews were members of a philosophical sect which de- oted its life to theology and astronomy. Such is the opinion f Aristotle's principal scholar Theophrastus [55] which is reflected lso by Clearchus. Yet the Greeks did not content themselves ith stating an analogy, but went on to explain the supposed milarities between the several priestly castes by causal con- ection. Following this principle, Clearchus made the Jews irect descendants of the Indian Gymnosophists and the latter f the Magi.[56] These priestly castes were fused by the imagina- on of the Greeks into a unique community of philosophers

---

nd Gaza were situated; Jerusalem was strategically without any importance. It was arcely entered by Greek troops, which were accompanied by historians, before a. 320. n this year Ptolemy I took the Holy City by assault and deported many Jews to gypt (Appian Syr. 50. Letter of Aristeas 12; see ZNTW (1932), 121, 1). Hecataeus f Abdera, the companion of Ptolemy I on his second campaign in Syria (a. 312), was he first Greek who is known to have been acquainted personally with Palestinian Jews, it even with him it is more than doubtful whether he ever set foot in Jerusalem ZNTW 1932, 128 ff.). These historical facts explain why in Alexander's age such im- erfect and obscure views circulated concerning the Jews.

[53] Cicero de divin. I, 2 therefore distinguishes between the 'natio Assyriorum' and he 'gens Chaldaeorum' of which it forms a part.

[54] 'Sapientiae sectae,' Plin. n. h. XXX, 1, 3.

[55] Porphyry, de abst. II, 26. Bernays, Theophrastos' Schrift ueber Froemmigkeit Berlin, 1866), 111.

[56] See note 27.

whose members were scattered over the whole Orient. The derivation of the several communities from the same root seemed to make possible the tacit transference of peculiarities, known only of one of these castes, to another; in this way is explained how the Jew of Clearchus could assume the traits of a Magus. All these combinations were purely of a literary character, and lacked the necessary corrective afforded by actual observation.

The enlargement of knowledge about the philosophical priests of the East gave a new impetus to writers of history, sciences and philosophy, in the earlier period of Hellenism:[57] and even literary domains more remote from them were affected by the increasing interest in Oriental teachings. One of these branches was the biographies of Greek sages, the writers of which, from the beginning, inclined to romantic embroidery and mere fiction. Thales, Pythagoras and other early sages were sent by these authors into the Orient to learn the mysteries of its indigenous wisdom.[58] Since they could not send all of them into the East, they invented figures of Oriental sages, who in their turn migrated to Greece and came into touch with the philosophers there: Mohammed had to go to the mountains of Attica. Especially Socrates, the prototype of Greek sobriety and enlightenment was chosen by Hellenistic writers to be confronted with possessors of Eastern supernatural insight. Aristoxenus of Tarentum, a pupil of Aristotle, in his life of Socrates,[59] had the Athenian meet an Indian, who asked him what he really was doing when philosophizing. When Socrates

[57] Theophrastus composed a work entitled 'Ακίχαρος (Diog. L. V, 50), in which he reproduced the wise teachings of the sage minister of the Assyrian king Sanherib. As is known, fragments of his story were discovered in an Aramaic version of the fifth century B.C. About the content of Theophrastus' book, of which the title alone is preserved, see Ed. Meyer, Papyrusfund von Elephantine (Leipzig, 1912), 124, 1, and H. Diels, Vorsokratiker II [3] 122, 13. Heraclides Ponticus wrote a book entitled Zoroaster (Plutarch adv. Colotem 14), that is perhaps identical with the dialogue in which he introduced a Magus who, at the court of the Sicilian king Gelon, gave report on the circumnavigation of Africa; Posidonius 87 F 28, 9 Jac. Cf. Bernays, Gesamm. Abhdlg. I, 42.

[58] Th. Hopfner, Orient und griechische Philosophie. Beihefte z. Alten Orient, Heft 4 (Leipzig, 1925).

[59] ap. Euseb. pr. ev. XI, 3, 8; FHG II, 281, frg. 31 Mueller.

eplied 'enquiring into human life,' the Indian laughed at him, nd declared that one could not understand human affairs ithout first knowing divine ones. The choice of an Indian to efend natural philosophy, which was disdained by Socrates,[60] as, as it seems, determined by the famous work of Megasthenes bout India.[61] Megasthenes who brought home from India is excellent account of Brahmanism and castes, relates that he Brahman theologians dealt particularly with the science of ature (*φυσιολογία*) and astronomy, and for a long time had een familiar with the doctrines of the "old" Hellenic phi-osophers.[62] Such comparisons made by travelers to India[63] pparently moved Aristoxenus to invent his story of the meet-ng between the Indian and Socrates.[64] But Clearchus too must ave been acquainted with the literature on India. His Aristotle xpressly refers, for the genealogy of the Calani, to an unknown uthority, as the additional words *ὥς φασιν* show.[65] The errone-us view about Calanus, after whom the Indians are said to ame their sages, is not found elsewhere save in Suidas,[66] who uoted it in a passage which partly coincides with a fragment of hares of Mytilene, an historian of Alexander.[67] Gutschmid[68] herefore considered him as Clearchus' authority. In any case, ne derivation of the Jews from the Indian philosophers goes ack to the combination of contemporary ethnographers. Megasthenes asserts in another place[69] that the doctrines of the

[60] Cf. Plato. Phaedo 96 f., Xen. Mem. I, 1, 11 ff. For other passages see Zeller I 1[3], 113 f., 114, 4. 116, 2.

[61] Aristoxenus acknowledges the influence of pro-Oriental biographers by telling at Pythagoras was the pupil of Zaratas the Chaldaean, a counterfeit of Zoroaster the agus; see Hippolyt. refutat. I, 2, 12 f.; cf. VI, 23, 2 ed. Wendland.

[62] Megasthenes ap. Strab. XV, 1, 70. 719 C: *τοὺς δὲ Βραχμᾶνας φυσιολογίαν καὶ στρονομίαν ἀσκεῖν.* Calanus was already mentioned by Nearchus, 133 F 23 Jac., as ember of the Indian sophists, who *τὰ περὶ τὴν φύσιν σκοποῦσι.*

[63] Comparisons between Greek and Indian teachings were established before egasthenes by travelers to India; see Onesicritus 134 F 17 Jac., about Indian and ynical form of life. Cf. Jac., p. 476 ad loc.

[64] For internal reasons see Hirzel 335, 1. Jaeger 165, 1.

[65] Jos. c. Ap. I, 179 *Οὗτοι* (sc. *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*) *δὲ εἰσιν ἀπόγονοι τῶν ἐν Ἰνδοῖς φιλοσόφων· λοῦνται δέ, ὥς φασιν, οἱ φιλόσοφοι παρὰ μὲν Ἰνδοῖς Καλανοί, παρὰ δε Σύροις Ἰουδαῖοι.*

[66] Suidas s.v. *Κάλανος· Ἰνδὸς ἐκ τῶν Βραχμάνων· οὗτω δὲ πάντα σοφὸν οἱ Ἰνδοὶ προσα-ρεύουσιν.*

[67] Chares frg. 15 Mueller (FSA, 117 f.).

[68] Kl. Schr. IV, 583.

[69] Megasthenes frg. 41 (II, 437 Mueller).

older Greek philosophers were known not only to the Indians, but also to the Jews. It is quite possible that such a statement, in which the wisdom of the Jews and Indians was connected, inspired Clearchus to change the analogy into a causality, by making the Jews descendants of the Indians.

The narrative of Aristoxenus was very likely [70] the model of a similar tale, preserved in the so-called Magicus. There Socrates is confronted with a wise Magus, who not only condemned his philosophical bearing, probably with the same motive as the Indian, but also prophesied that by virtue of his mantic power, he would die a violent death: [71] the Socratic *daimonion* here gives place to magic demonology. The motive too was seemingly derived from the historians of Alexander who maintained that the Chaldaean priests in Babylon had foretold to the king of Macedon his approaching death.[72] The Magicus, which was ascribed in antiquity, not only to others but also to Aristotle, was certainly composed in the course of the third century B.C.,[73] and bears all the traits common to a panoriental view of culture.[74] The origins of philosophy are to be sought among the Barbarians: Magi,[75] Chaldaeans, Indians and others.

[70] V. Rose, Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus, 50.

[71] Diog. Laert. II, 45 (Aristot. frg. 32 Rose): Jaeger, Aristotle 165 n. 1 has confused the Indian of Aristoxenus with the Magus in the Magicus.

[72] Arrian., Anabasis VII, 22. 1; Plutarch, Alexandr. 73; Appian. bell. civ. II, 153. The theory was widespread. Theopompus or Philochorus (Gellius XV, 20, 4) told that a Chaldaean prophesied the future glory of his newborn son to Euripides' father.

[73] The *terminus ante quem* of the Magicus is the History of Philosophy by Sotion (200–170 B.C.), who used the Magicus in the section 'About the philosophy among the Barbarians' (Aristot. frg. 35 Rose and Jaeger, 135 n. 1). Consequently, Antisthenes of Rhodos, a historian of the second century B.C., to whom the Magicus was also ascribed (frg. 33), cannot have been its author, as Ed. Meyer, Ursprung d. Christent. II, 91 n. 3, suggested.

[74] An anonymous writer, quoted by Diogenes (prooem. 9), derived the Jews directly from the Magi; Ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐκ τούτων (sc. τῶν μάγων) εἶναί (sc. φασίν.). Diogenes' source was Sotion (n. 73). Consequently, this author must have lived at latest in the third century. I suggest that Sotion borrowed this notice from the Magicus.

[75] The author of the Magicus emphasizes the fact that the true Magi did not practice the γοητικὴ μαντεία, but taught pure mantic; frg. 36 Rose. For other passages cf. Clemen, Griech. und lat. Nachrichten ueber die persische Religion, 206 f. "But even this passage shows that the figurative sense (of the word Magi) was quite familiar to

t was finally a Magus who, in the Pseudo-Platonic Axiochus 371a), communicated to Socrates his knowledge of Hades. His ame Gobryes originated from the list of names of Magi preerved by the historian Xanthus the Lydian (s. V B.C.),[76] who n Hellenistic times enjoyed almost as much esteem as the amous Ctesias as an authority on Oriental affairs. In all these ases, the 'Socratics' borrowed their knowledge on Eastern visdom from the historians of their age.

The Jew of Clearchus must be set in the group of these epresentatives of Oriental priestly wisdom. He is one of the Barbarians' who, when confronted with one of the great Greek philosophers, showed himself superior both in sagacity and igher knowledge.[77] The praise that Clearchus' Aristotle betowed upon the Jew (that he was a Greek, not only in language, but also in soul),[78] corresponds, if we set aside the affected style f the formulation (which made a great impression, and not nly on Josephus) to the view of the historians and ethnographers in Alexander's time about the wisdom of the Magi, Chaldaeans and Indians.

---

he Greeks"; Ed. Meyer, II, 74, 2. Apuleius, Apology c. 25 f., who refers to [Plato] lcib. I 122 a, *μαγείαν . . . θεῶν θεραπεία*, therefore distinguishes between the superior heosophy of the Magi and the *mos vulgaris* of the magic exorcists. Clearchus' Jew is o be considered as 'magician' and theosopher in one person.

[76] See Diog. Laert. prooem. 2.

[77] The phrase *πειρώμενος αὐτῶν τῆς σοφίας* (Jos. c. Ap. I, 181) recalls similar debates eported by Hellenistic writers. Alexander the Great put to the Indian sages speculative uestions; *ἐρωτήματα προὔβαλεν ἄπορα* Plutarch, Alex. 64. Ptolemy II subjected the ewish ambassadors to a similar examination; Philo, de vita Mosis II, 33, II. 139 M., *ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀπεπειρᾶτο τῆς ἑκάστου σοφίας καινὰς . . . ζητήσεις προτείνων*. Philon's ource was the Letter of Aristeas.

[78] Jos. c. Ap. I, 180, *οὗτος οὖν ὁ ἄνθρωπος . . . Ἑλληνικὸς ἦν οὐ τῇ διαλέκτῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ*. For this use of *ψυχή* cf. Heraclitus 12 B 107 Diels *βαρβάρους ψυχάς*; Plato, Timaeus 22 b 6 *νέοι ἐστὲ τὰς ψυχάς*; Julian about the Christians (ep. 204 ed. Bidez-Cumont) *οἱ τὴν γνώμην βάρβαροι καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἄθεοι*. The antithesis *διάλεκτος* : *ψυχή* is ffected, while that of *φωνή*: *τρόπος* is usual, Isocrates, ep. 9, 8; cf. Cicero, de rep. I, 58 *ingua*: *mores*, according to Isocrates, paneg. 50. So *γλῶσσα* : *ἴδιαι τα* Herodot., IV, 78, ff.; Plutarch, de facie in orbe lunae 26, 6. *φωνή* : *γνώμη*, epist. Anachars. 1; p. 102 Iercher. Agatharchides (s. III B.C.) tells in his book about the Red Sea (ap. Phot. . 442 a 23), that he got the explanation of the sea's name from a Persian living in Athens and named Boxus, *ὃν καὶ ἑλληνίσαι γλῶσσαν καὶ γνώμην*. The same combination f *γλῶσσα* and *γνώμη* occurs in the vita Auxentii (s. VI A.D.), Migne, PG 114, 1428 B: *οὗτος . . . τῇ γλώττῃ μὲν βάρβαρος ὑπῆρχεν . . . , τῇ γνώμῃ δὲ πάνσεμνος*; see K. Holl, ges.

III

Our investigation has led us as far from its starting point, as the Jew of Clearchus is remote from a real representative of his race. This figure of dialogue is an invention of the writer,[79] who apparently indulged the taste of readers, "who listened with a particular delight to beliefs about the soul, if they were blended with fables," [80] and satisfied the prevailing taste by choosing one of the sage 'Barbarians' as counterpart of Aristotle. All who are resolved to continue to defend his actual existence, find themselves in the unpleasant position of being obliged to believe as well the historical genuineness of Plato's Er, the son of Armenius, and of the many dialogue figures [81] created in his image.[82]

For the defenders of the historical reality of this dubious personage, there remains only the reference to Josephus' concluding remarks. He says, after having given his literal quotation, that Aristotle, in Clearchus dialogue, "had discussed the great and miraculous endurance of the Jewish man in diet

---

Aufsaetze z. Kirchengeschichte II, 239. According to Strabo, 662 C, the hellenization of the barbarians consists in 'Ελληνικῶς ζῆν ἢ μανθάνειν τὴν ἡμετέραν διάλεκτον.

[79] Cf. the judicious criticism of Zeller, II, 2_3, 896, 3, 'Nur als Erfindung des Literaten werden wir auch das von Klearch berichtete Gespraech zwischen Aristoteles und einem Juden . . . anzusehen haben.' Similarly Wilamowitz, Glaube der Hellenen II 255, 2.

[80] Plutarch, de audiendis poetis 1. mor. 14 E, τὰ περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν δόγματα μεμιγμένα μυθολογίᾳ μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἐνθουσιῶσι. It is not an accident, that the participants of the discourses reproduced in Plato's Phaedo and the Republic express their readiness to listen to the myth 'with pleasure,' ἡδέως; Phaedo 108 d 3, cf. 110 b 4., Rep. 614 b, 1. In Clearchus, this aesthetic motif is missing, because he relates a fact and not a myth.

[81] See Rohde II, 94, 1, 'Hiernach wird es deutlich, dass Empedotimos [see note 46] nur eine Dialogfigur des Heraklides war und wohl so wenig jemals existiert hat wie Er der Sohn des Armenios oder Thespesios von Soli oder dessen Vorbild Kleonymos von Athen bei Klearch von Soli.' Similarly Wilamowitz, Platon I, 715.

[82] In point of historical fact there remains nothing from the whole fancy of the Jewish thaumaturge. Very probably, Clearchus once observed some wandering juggler making hypnotic experiments on a boy. Similar magic tricks with children as media are testified to by Apuleius, Apology c. 42 f., Origenes de princ. III, 3, 3 and Hippolyt. refut. IV, 28. The people called these sorcerers Magi (according to Origenes, l. c.). This popular use may have stimulated the imagination of a capricious writer to his orientalizing romance. — 'Das also war des Pudels Kern. . . .'

nd temperance." [83] If Clearchus thereby hinted at the Jew's bstinence from certain foods, he would have reproduced at ast one characteristic trait of Judaism, from which it might be nferred that he really had before him a true representative of nis people, to whom he afterwards attributed a foreign bearing. t is certain that Josephus himself wished to convey the im- ression that Clearchus had praised the ritual of the Jew. This eing so, the question immediately arises again, as to why he id not copy these words, which would have been so favorable to is purpose, and surely not too numerous, but only represented nem by the most general expressions he could find. His behav- r arouses the suspicion that this "miraculous endurance in diet nd temperance" was not so completely in harmony with the ewish precepts that he could have quoted the few sentences in neir original draft.[84] Whoever has so far followed the course this study with agreement, will scarcely think it natural nat the habits of the pseudo-Jewish hypnotist corresponded to ne dietary regulations of Leviticus. There exists at least a ossibility that other miraculous faculties were imputed to the ew which were of the same quality as his hypnotic gifts. In vor of such a supposition, a further indication can be drawn om the passage quoted by Josephus.

His citation begins with the words: "Yet it would be too long deal with this fully: but it may not be amiss to discuss what ows in him certain gifts of magic and love of wisdom in like anner." [85] The quotation begins in the middle of Aristotle's

[83] Jos. c. Ap. I, 182 *Ταῦτ' εἴρηκεν ὁ 'Αριστοτέλης παρὰ τῷ Κλεάρχῳ καὶ προσέτι λλὴν καὶ θαυμάσιον καρτερίαν τοῦ 'Ιουδαίου ἀνδρὸς ἐν τῇ διαίτῃ καὶ σωφροσύνην διεξιών.*

[84] In excuse of Josephus we could say only, that he had found the quotation already tailed in an apologetic collection of Greek testimonia concerning Jews, and failed consult the unabridged original. It is, indeed, very probable that he perused one or re works of this type while preparing his pamphlet against Apion; see J. Freudenthal. xander Polyhistor (Breslau, 1875), 170, 1 and Hoelscher in Re s.v. Josephus, col. 06 f. In this case, the responsibility may be cast on his predecessors.

[85] Jos. c. Ap. T, 177: *'Αλλὰ τὰ μὲν πολλὰ μακρὸν ἂν εἴη λέγειν, ὅσα δ' ἔχει τῶν νου θαυμασιότητά τινα καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ὁμοίως, διελθεῖν οὐ χεῖρον.* This sentence is ar- ged quite symmetrically: *μακρὸν ἂν εἴη λέγειν* corresponds to *διελθεῖν χεῖρον* (sc. *ἄν*), and *τὰ μὲν πολλά* to *ὅσα* till *ὁμοίως*. *Ὁμοίως* depends grammatically on *ἔχει* and ers logically to the preceding noun *φιλοσοφίαν*, cf. e.g. Thucyd. I, 20, 1. It empha- es the strange combination of both virtues in the same person. Reinach corrects

account of his meeting with the Jew. Josephus has curtailed it at the beginning and the end, in order to convey to his reader the most completely favorable impression of this Jewish 'super-Greek.' As is shown by the first words of the quotation (the typical formula of transition) which refers back, Aristotle had already spoken of the Jew, without denoting him for the present as such; for it is only later that he supplies the remarks concerning his origin and the praise of his education. Further, it follows from his words, that he had spoken before about other remarkable attributes of the man, which are now coupled with his miraculous power and wisdom. Gutschmid [86] has already suggested that Aristotle, in the passage omitted at the beginning, even spoke about this very *θαυμάσιος καρτερία τοῦ Ἰουδαίου ἀνδρὸς ἐν τῇ διαίτῃ καὶ σωφροσύνῃ*, which is emphasized by Josephus in his conclusion. This supposition is supported by the fact, that, during the description of the following action (supposed to be an hypnotic experiment), hardly a possibility existed for the narrator, to return to the personal qualities of the man. Yet in this case, it is strange that the description of his asceticism was expressly separated from his real characteristics. Hence it follows that very probably they had no connection with each other. The description was therefore very likely combined with the theme of the dialogue concerning sleep, and perhaps formed the transition from the general subject of the discourse to the personality of the ascetic. But what connection can exist between sleep and an asceticism which is described by Josephus so ambigu-

---

ὁμοίως into *ὅμως*, but I do not think it necessary to alter the text if we accept the above interpretation.

[86] Gutschmid's eminent merits in the interpretation of Josephus' work against Apion have been mentioned above; yet unfortunately he barred his way to the right understanding of the fragment of Clearchus by his belief in the historical reality of the Jew. We are no more justified in considering Clearchus' tale "as the oldest testimony about the Jewish diaspora in Asia Minor and about its early intimate intercourse with the Greeks" (Neue Beitraege zur Geschichte des Alten Orients 77, 1. Kl. Schr. IV, 586). His reference to Obadiah 20, Sepharad, which at his time was held to be the name of the satrapy Lydia (Çparda), is to be given up since a bilingual inscription of Sardis has shown that Sardis herself is meant; Sardis, Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis, vol. VI. Lydian Inscriptions, part I, by E. Littmann (Leyden, 1916), 12. (I owe this reference to H. J. Polotsky.)

usly as 'great and miraculous'? This question can be answered with the help of a new fragment which Bernays singled ut from the mass of Aristotelian fragments and related to this ork of Clearchus, without assigning to it a definite place there- i.[87] According to this passage, preserved by the Neoplatonist lympiodorus in his commentary on Plato's Phaedo 111 a,[88] ristotle told how he met [89] a man, who 'did not sleep at all' (ὕπνον)[90] and 'nourished himself with sunlike air.' The short escription of this really extraordinary man combines the two ualities demanded above for the Jew; further, it fits closely the llowing story as it is preserved by Josephus, and thirdly, it xplains the severe mutilation of the original. This unfortunate reliminary remark had, like the later narration of the boy's ypnosis, to be removed at all costs, if the Jew were to be taken riously as a trustworthy witness of his race's antiquity and nlightenment. Since the accuracy of the quotation could be sted by the original, Josephus paraphrased the content of learchus' 'preliminary remark' in ambiguous words deliberely reminding the reader of familiar conceptions, and slurred ver the main story with the vague remark that Clearchus had assed to another theme, because "his main design was of a fferent nature" (*τὸ γὰρ προκείμενον ἦν αὐτῷ καθ' ἕτερον*, Jos. c. p. I, 183). In order to protect himself in advance against all ossible accusations of patent forgery, he copied the real cita-

[87] Bernays, Theophrastos' Schrift ueber Froemmigkeit, 187.

[88] Olympiodori in Plat. Phaed. comment., p. 200, 3 ff. Norvin (Leipzig, 1913), *δὲ δεῖ τι καὶ ὅλον γένος ἀνθρώπων εἶναι οὕτω τρεφόμενον, δηλοῖ καὶ ὁ τῇδε ταῖς ἡλιακαῖς ῥῖσι μόναις τρεφόμενος, ὃν ἱστόρησεν Ἀριστοτέλης ἰδὼν αὐτός.* b. ad eundem locum 239, 19 ff. Norvin): *Εἰ ἐνταῦθα ἱστόρησεν Ἀριστοτέλης ἄνθρωπον ἄυπνον καὶ μόνῳ ἠλιοειδεῖ τρεφόμενον ἀέρι, τί χρὴ περὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ οἴεσθαι;* Rose, Aristot. frg. 42, noted rnays' identification in the apparatus criticus, but apparently could not persuade nself to single out the testimony from the group of fragments assigned to the Eudeis of the genuine Aristotle.

[89] Olympiodorus added 'on this earth' (*ἐνταῦθα, τῇδε*), because Plato, in the myth Phaedo 111a, had spoken about the dwelling-place of the pure spirits in the 'upper th.'

[90] Bernays did not realize the relation between the fragment discovered by him and quotation preserved by Josephus. Therefore he proposed to correct *ἄυπνον* to *νουν*, appealing to Heraclides' work *περὶ τῆς ἄπνου*, mentioned in note 46. But the *νία* is required as much by the theme of the discourse as by the coherence of the con- t.

tion with mechanical literalness and added the following comment which looks rather innocent, yet becomes intelligible in its full extent only now: [91] "Any who wish to hear more details, may look it up in Clearchus' book. For I refrain from quoting more than is absolutely necessary." [92]

Whence did Clearchus get this strange characterization? We have meanwhile, I think, recognized his methods insofar as we are able to suggest that he did not draw it from the air (even a 'sunlike' one). It can be shown that, in this case too, he followed a certain literary model, whose author again came from the circle of Platonic writers: — and this was no accident. The 'sunlike air' on which the miracle-worker feeds, is the ether, which, according to a widespread popular creed, [93] is the original element of the soul and, after its departure from the body, is to become its dwelling-place: [94] for the air is full of souls which continue their 'uncorporeal' life after their release from the body. [95] This conception of a realm of 'freed' souls in the upper regions of the ether was made the basis of the romantic story, mentioned earlier, by Plato's pupil Heraclides Ponticus. There he described the vision of a certain Empedotimus who saw the dwelling-place of the light-formed (*φωτοειδής*) souls in the Milky Way. [96] The phantasies of Heraclides are embroidered by various metaphysical teachings, but go back to Pythagoras who had based his ascetic command, to keep the soul clean, on

[91] Jos. c. Ap. I, 182: *Ἔνεστι δὲ τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ πλέον γνῶναι τοῦ βιβλίου· φυλάττομαι γὰρ ἐγὼ πλείω τῶν ἱκανῶν παρατίθεσθαι.*

[92] When Josephus prepared the chapter dealing with Greek writers concerning Jews he became aware that he was in want of material proofs; for, as he himself declares (c. Ap. I, 5 ff.), the Jews were very rarely mentioned in the Greek literature of the fifth and fourth century B.C. Since his own knowledge of Greek literature was very scant and the references of his sources (see note 84) did not suffice for the epoch in question he felt compelled to take refuge in forcible interpretations. In fact, neither his quotation from Herodotus (I, 168 f.), nor that from Choerilus (I, 172 f.) nor, as can be shown, that from Theophrastus (I, 166 f.), applied to the Jews. This difficulty explains why he did not want to give up Clearchus, whose testimony would fit his purposes only after a thorough recasting.

[93] Rohde, Psyche II, 259 ff.

[94] Rohde, 384, 2 and passim.

[95] Rohde, 161 ff. 165, 2. 257 ff. 320.

[96] Rohde, 320, 1; cf. 94, 1. The soul is, according to Heraclides, an *αἰθέριον σῶμα φωτοειδής*. See Re s.v. Herakleides, no. 45. col. 476.

ıe doctrine of its uncorporeal existence after death. Such :range imaginings, in this famous work, may have stirred learchus' ambition [97] to surpass the ecstatic man who, during a ıort vision, perceived 'the whole truth of the soul,' [98] by a ıperman who anticipated the form of being a 'pure soul' hile still in this world. His wonder-worker, whom we may :arcely dare with him to call a Jew, already fulfiled the romises of the future state during his terrestrial existence. He ourished himself on the pure subsistence of souls, and was also :lieved of the other 'need of the body,' sleep. He was in some egree a true *pneumatikos*, the first of his type in Greek liter- ture, a pure soul who had overcome all the limitations of ırthly life.

His food also explains his hypnotic capacities. The ethereal ıbstance which the thaumaturge absorbed, possessed, accord- ıg to Heraclides, magnetic powers. Empedotimus, the hero of is myth of the soul, was *caught* by the light 'which revolves ınd the Gods.' [99] It was his communication with the ethereal orld which empowered the 'pneumatic' of Clearchus to bring ıout the separation of the ethereal soul from the body of a ıedium, which was put into a state of sleep,[100] the 'image of eath.' If this is so, it seems to be definitely proved that the agments preserved by Proclus and Olympiodorus complement ıch other, and that on both occasions the Aristotle of learchus spoke of the same miraculous man.

Such phantasies are so far removed from the doctrines of ıdaism that one can scarcely admit of any mutual relations :tween them. Notwithstanding, a path, suitably rather hereal, led from the Jewish teaching to the Clearchian pneu- atology. The Greeks mentioned the Jews from early times as eing among the Oriental nations who believed in the immor-

[97] In the second book of his 'Bioi' (frg. 2; Athen. IV, 157c), Clearchus related the ıching of another Pythagorean; who told that the souls are punished by being tied to eir body, and pray for release from their corporeal prison; see Rohde II, 122, 1. 161, 2.

[98] *πᾶσαν τὴν περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἀλήθειαν*, Heraclides ap. Procl., l. c. See Rohde, II, 94, 1.

[99] Heraclides ap. Procl., l. c., II, 119, 25 Kroll: *καταλημφθῆναι μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς τοῦ οιθέοντος κύκλῳ τοὺς θεούς*.

[100] The magnetic powers of the hypnotist were transferred to his staff, which did t contain magic virtues in itself.

tality of the soul; Clearchus himself, as we saw, made the Jewish miracle-worker produce a proof of the separate existence of the soul. Hermippus (s. III B.C.), one of the first representatives of the pro-Oriental legend about Pythagoras, therefore represented the founder of the doctrine of the soul's migration as a pupil of the Jews.[101] This express connection between the Oriental and Pythagorean creeds of immortality[102] may perhaps also help to trace the way in which Clearchus silently formed his view of the Jewish creed of the soul. In the casual way in which he arbitrarily derived Jews, Magi and Gymnosophists, each from the other, he took up the Pythagorean fables of Heraclides Ponticus in order to adorn them with the supposed Jewish creed of eternity. In both cases he treated as identical things, whose resemblance had already been perceived by other writers, and interchanged the details noticed in the two analogues.

IV

The results of this investigation create an unfavorable opinion of Clearchus' critical qualities. This judgment is wholly confirmed if we take his other writings into consideration.[103] Clearchus was an educated writer who wished to give a fashionable shape to the mind and feelings of a changing world susceptible to all impressions.[104] His main work dealt with the modes in which the Greeks and Barbarian peoples lived (Βίοι). In addition to this, he wrote concerning friendship (περὶ φιλίας), animals, proverbs, riddles, Erotica, an encomium on Plato, etc. It is not easy to form a clear opinion of his mental type from the preserved fragments. The majority of them are to be found in

[101] Hermippus, ap. Jos. c. Ap., I, 165. The wording of the fragment shows that Hermippus treated the Jewish belief in the soul's immortality as well known.

[102] It is also possible that Clearchus had no direct information of the alleged Jewish creed of immortality, but derived his view from an argument by analogy. The Magi were in his opinion the model of the Jewish philosophers (see above p. 211) and, according to his contemporary Aristoxenus (see note 61), the teachers of Pythagoras. It may be noted, that Neanthes (about 300 B.C.) had made Pythagoras a Syrian and a pupil of the Chaldaeans living in Tyros; see Porphyry, Life of Pythagoras c. 1.

[103] Cf. Re s.v. Klearchos von Soli. FHG II, 302 ff. Mueller.

[104] Cf. F. Leo, Griech.-roem. Biographie, 98 f.

he so-called "banquet of philosophers" of Athenaeus, who, om an undoubtedly large store, picked up the most piquant ories. Yet the tendency of this selection, made by a man in- rested in gossip and curiosities, must not be confused with that the actual books on which he drew. What should we know out Plato, if we were solely informed by the idle talk of his ntemporary fellow-citizens, reported with such gusto by the me Athenaeus? [105] Further a more detailed enquiry, however, ows some uniform tendency in these multifarious interests. learchus, almost throughout the quotations, is endowed with e title of Peripatetic. The coincidence between the themes his works and those of Theophrastus, both of whom wrote ερὶ ἔρωτος, περὶ βίων, περὶ ζῴων, περὶ παροιμιῶν, περὶ ὕπνου, περὶ ιλιδείας,[106] is explained by their common studies under the me master; [107] it was above all Aristotle's interest in the story of culture and nature that had been transferred to learchus. His works were full of interesting observations and cts which were to become a rich booty for the citation-hunters the Roman age. His philosophic attitude shows a healthy npiricism,[108] his morality wears, as has been said of that of ion the Cynic, the gown of a *hetaera*. Above all, Clearchus ems to have lacked all sense of criticism and arrangement; parently he lacked both the will and the ability either to find e transition from an associative setting forth of thoughts to eir systematic organization, or to distinguish between im- obabilities and trustworthy facts. He was by nature a nar- tor of detached anecdotes; every curiosity, no matter whether was a zoological phenomenon, a proverb, a riddle or a pi- ancy, incited him to try his stylistic qualities. His affected anner of writing and the possession of an effective means of

[105] The many examples for the τρυφερὸς βίος, borrowed from the 'Bioi' of Clearchus d preserved by Athenaeus, must not be taken as the expression of the author's view. e tendency of the whole work was even opposed to it, as the moral application shows; frg. 24 (Athen. XIII, 611 b).

[106] On Theophrastus' works see Diog. Laert. V, 42 ff. The Γεργίθιος of Clearchus g. 2 f.) corresponded, as to the choice of the theme, to Theophrastus' treatise περὶ ακείας. In the same way, the Ἐρωτικά of Clearchus recall the ἐρωτικὰ προβλήματα Aristotle (Schweighaeuser).

[107] The majority of these titles are to be found also in the catalogues of Aristotle's itings; see Arist. frg., p. 3 ff. Rose.

[108] Cf. e.g. frg. 10. 18. 22. Mueller.

expression, combined with vast erudition, gained for him the esteem of ancient critics, reproduced literally by Josephus as well as Athenaeus.[109]

As regards his domain of interests, Clearchus can be counted among the Peripatetics. Concerning the time and the external conditions of his life, no direct tradition has come down to us. Doubtless, he had once been a pupil of Aristotle, yet their relations can scarcely have been more than transitory; he is not counted among the real representatives of the school.[110] Probably he turned to individual writing at an early date, seeking to propagate in a more popular form the results of the researches of the Peripatus into the history of habits and nature. He seems to have lived on to the middle of the third century B.C.; for one of his works was dedicated to a certain Arcesilaus, who was very likely identical with the later head of the Academy.[111]

In the fragments of Clearchus several themes are mentioned which were the subjects of the Academicians, and which are even related to the names of their works. Plato's pupil and successor Speusippus composed a memorial oration on the funeral banquet of his master, bearing the title Πλάτωνος περίδειπνον,[112] in which he related the legend of Plato's divine descent. A work bearing a similar title (Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον) and containing the same story, was also known as of Clearchus.[113] In the same way, his work about the ideal number in Plato's Republic (Rep. 546B) rivaled in the presentation of the theme, with a work of the Platonic Xenocrates and perhaps also with the views of the Academician Crantor.[114] Further, close contacts between

[109] Athen., XV, 701 c (frg. 46 Mueller), Κλέαρχος ὁ Σολεὺς οὐδενὸς ὢν δεύτερος τῶν τοῦ σοφοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους μαθητῶν; Jos. c. Ap. I, 176, Κλέαρχος . . . ὁ Ἀριστοτέλους ὢν μαθητὴς καὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ περιπάτου φιλοσόφων οὐδενὸς δεύτερος. Cf. Gutschmid, 578: "Wahrscheinlich ein traditionell gewordenes Urteil."

[110] Plutarch, de facie lun. 2, 5. 920E (frg. 76 Mueller), Ἀριστοτέλους . . . γεγονὼς συνήθης, εἰ καὶ πολλὰ τοῦ Περιπάτου παρέτρεψεν.

[111] Cf. frg. 44 a Mueller; see note 115.

[112] Diog. Laert. III, 2; cf. Re s.v. Speusippos p. 1667 f.

[113] Diog. Laert. III, 2. The objections of P. Lang, de Speusippi Academici scriptis (Diss. Bonn, 1911), 32 ff. against the authorship of Clearchus of Soli disappear, now he is placed midway between the Academy and the Peripatus.

[114] See Clearchus, frg. 44 and 77, Mueller. R. Heinze, Xenokrates, 47 ff. Re s. v. Clearchus, p. 582.

learchus' Pythagoreanism and that of Heraclides Ponticus, ıe Platonist most interested in that philosophy, have been :ated above. These mental relations seem to have been estab-shed on the basis of personal friendship.[115]

Thus the themes of all the works of Clearchus, as far as their ames have come down to us, can be divided between the in-erests of the two rival schools. An intermediate position of ıis kind between the Academy and the Lyceum was most ngular in an epoch which saw the beginning of the quarrels etween the two schools and of their dogmatic obstinacy. his makes Clearchus' personality and actions an object of ıuch more interest to historians of philosophy, than to his-orians of literature; Clearchus was the first of a long line of ncient and medieval philosophers, who endeavored to har-ıonize the contradictions in the doctrines of Plato and Aris-otle.[116] His conduct in this matter explains the remark of lutarch that he had deviated from the truly peripatetic eachings 'in many things.' [117] But above all, it helps to explain ıe general tendency of his work 'concerning sleep,' the special bject of this study.

V

Aristotle's views on Plato's doctrine of the soul underwent, ı the course of his life, a fundamental change.[118] It changed om his master's belief in the soul as a substance separable from

[115] Clearchus called one of his treatises by the name of Arcesilaus, see note 111. As is nerally supposed (see Re s.v. Klearchos, p. 581), the receiver of this dedication can arcely have been other than the future founder of the Middle Academy, who was born 316 and became head of his school *ca.* 268. This identification is supported by the ct, that Arcesilaus' teacher and beloved friend, Crantor the Platonician, came from e same place as Clearchus, — Soli in Cilicia. Clearchus agreed with Crantor's views ı the harmonic figures in Plato's Timaeus, see Plutarch, de animae procreat. 20 (1022 frg. 77 Mueller). It may be supposed that Clearchus became acquainted with the ıunger Arcesilaus through the intermediation of his town-fellow Crantor.

[116] Heraclides Ponticus, who alone could be mentioned besides Clearchus, was often lled a Peripatetic; but in fact, he is not to be considered as a pupil of Aristotle. He ceded from him after Plato's death and, after Speusippus' death (in 338), returned to his native town, the remote Heraclea on the Pontus, where he maintained the ews of the older Plato, without being affected by Aristotle's later teachings.

[117] See note 110.

[118] Cf. Jaeger, Aristotle, 45 ff.

the body, to a conception of an undissoluble harmony between body and soul which dies with it. The Aristotle of Clearchus is still a pure Platonist. He becomes convinced by the experiment of the sleeping boy that "the soul departs from the body and enters into it and dwells in it as in an inn." [119] Aristotle puts forward here purely Platonic views, as a glance at the Phaedo shows.[120] Apparently it was with full intention that Clearchus transferred this episode to Assos, i.e. to a time when Aristotle had just left the Academy. The dialogue occurred later, as is pointed out; namely in Athens, after the foundation of his own school, in the circle of the Peripatetics. But now too, Aristotle persists in the Platonic standpoint. This combination of past and present cannot be fortuitous. It must have a purpose of the moment which cannot have been other than to demonstrate Aristotle's consistent maintenance of Plato's teaching of the soul. The choice of Aristotle as the leader in the discussion was therefore not merely a literary pleasantry, but intended to give a quasi-authentic view of Aristotle's true opinion on this problem.[121] Clearchus' Aristotle takes the same intermediate position as his creator.

It can easily be imagined that such a Platonized interpretation of the Aristotelian doctrine of the soul provoked oppositio

[119] Proclus, quoted note 16, *ὡς ἄρα χωρίζεται τοῦ σώματος καὶ ὡς εἴσεισιν εἰς τὸ σῶμα καὶ ὡς χρῆται αὐτῷ ὡς καταγωγίῳ.* For *χωρίζεται* see Plato, Phaedo 67 c ff. For the comparison between the body and an inn, *καταγώγιον*, cf. the passages quoted by A. D. Nock, Sallustius concerning the Gods and the Universe (Cambridge, 1926), xxxi, n. 8. To these patristic parallels may be added a gnostic testimony. According to Hippolytus, refut. VI, 34, the Valentinians held the *ὑλικὸς ἄνθρωπος οἱονεὶ πανδοχεῖον ἢ κατοικητήριον ποτὲ μὲν ψυχῆς μόνης, ποτὲ δὲ ψυχῆς καὶ δαιμόνων, ποτὲ δὲ ψυχῆς καὶ λόγων.* See also the famous poem of the dying Hadrianus, 'Animula vagula blandula, *hospes* comesque corporis,' etc., Spart. Hadr. 25, 9 (FPL 137 Morel).

[120] It may be objected against Bernays, Zwei Abhandlungen ueber die aristotelische Theorie des Dramas, 91, that the Aristotle of Clearchus maintained the soul's, and not the reason's separability from the body. This is a truly Platonic view which contradicts the principle of the later Aristotle on the *θύραθεν νοῦς*. Since Bernays denied a Platonic period in Aristotle's development, he subsequently did not know what to do about this suspect testimony which he himself had discovered. Jaeger's epoch-making investigations on Aristotle have prepared the way for fixing the place of Clearchus' work on sleep within the history of ancient philosophy.

[121] Stilpo the Sceptic (about 320 B.C.) wrote a dialogue *Ἀριστοτέλης*, Diog. Laert. II, 120; but unfortunately nothing except the title is preserved, see Hirzel, Dialog I, 309, 3. 315, 3.

nong the more rigid Peripatetics. About the various contri-
ıtions περὶ ψυχῆς, given by Theophrastus, Aristoxenus and
icaearchus, the most outstanding figures of the Peripatus
ter Aristotle's death, we know that they all contested the
ndamental dogma of the Platonic doctrine of immortality:
ıe creed of the existence of a soul separable from the body.[122]
nfortunately, the few fragments preserved from their works,
) not suffice to convey a clear insight into the details of their
nets. Sure arguments concerning the object of this study can
ıly be inferred from one of the documents in which is men-
oned Dicaearchus' attack on the Platonic principle of im-
ortality.

The church writer Lactantius enumerates in the course of his
atements about the soul's immortality, as main contestants,
emocritus, Epicurus and Dicaearchus. After having quoted
gainst them the teachings of other philosophers, Pythagoras,
lato and — Hermes Trismegistus, he states resolutely: "Thus
ıe opinion of Democritus, Epicurus and Dicaearchus about
ıe dissolution of the soul is wrong. These men would certainly
ɔt dare to discuss their view in the presence of any Magus,
ho would know, that souls can be invoked from the under-
orld by certain magic formulas, that they appear, show them-
lves before human beings, and speak and foretell the future.
nd if they should dare to continue in spite of this, they would
ɛ refuted by facts and manifest evidence." [123] Why does the
Iagus suddenly appear in the midst of these resolute deniers
the soul's eternity? It is sure that Lactantius had not cited
im from his own imagination. Convinced Christian as he was,
ɛ could not acknowledge the delusions of the magic arts. In
ıother passage, where he reproduced the Christian view, he
eclared that the evil spirits, evoked by the magicians, "dazzle
ıe eyes of mankind by their delusions, so that they do not see

[122] Cf. Zeller II, 2[3], 888 ff. Rohde, Psyche II, 309, 2.

[123] Lactantius, div. inst. VII, 13, 7 (Dicaearchus, frg. 66 Mueller), 'Falsa est ergo emocriti et Epicuri et Dicaearchi de animae dissolutione sententia. Qui profecto non derent de interitu animarum mago aliquo praesente disserere, qui sciret certis carnibus cieri ab inferis animas et adesse et praebere se humanis oculis videndas et loqui futura praedicere, et si auderent, re ipsa et documentis praesentibus vincerentur.'

what is real and believe they see what is not." [124] A Magus whose exorcism served as proof of the immortality of the soul — this motive Lactantius could only have borrowed from a pagan source.[125] From the context in which the passage quoted above is found, it is plain that his main authority was Cicero's Tusculanae I, where the defenders and opponents of the principle of immortality were introduced with short remarks about their main arguments.[126] Here the views of the three arch- opponents of the soul's eternity are to be found connected,[127] but their confrontation with the teaching of the Magi is still missing. It follows that Lactantius must have taken it from another source. Epicurus and Dicaearchus were not represented, by ancient writers, as having contact with Oriental people. On the other hand, there existed a rich literature on Democritus, who, during his travels, was said to have become a pupil of the Magi, Chaldaeans and other sage priests.[128] In this way, Democritus was even made out to be a pupil of Ostanes, one of the legendary heads of the Magi in the fifth century.[129] This branch of pseudo-literature was well known to the Christians, and was often quoted by Tertullian, Cyprian and Minucius Felix, Lactantius' models.[130] In their work Democritus appeared as an adept of the Magi, and performed prodigious cures.[131] The contradiction between the strict denial of the soul's eternity, which belonged to the true Democritus

[124] Lact., div. inst. II, 14, 10, 'visus hominum praestigiis obcaecantibus fallunt, ... non videant ea, quae sunt, et videre se putent illa, quae non sunt.' Lactantius' model was Minucius Felix, Octavia 26, 10; cf. Tertullian, Apologet. c. 22 ff. and de anima c. 57.

[125] Lactantius did not borrow this view from his own knowledge, as we infer from the chronological order in which the Greek philosophers are put by him; see VII, 8, 8 'Dicaearchus primo (!), deinde Democritus, postremo Epicurus. . . .'

[126] Thus the testimony of Lactantius is to be cancelled in Mueller's collection of Dicaearchus' fragments (FHG II 266); see note 123.

[127] On Lactantius' reading of Cicero, see H. Diels, Doxographi Graeci 121, 1.

[128] Diog. Laert. IX, 34 ff.; Diels Vorsokr. 55 A 1. Democritus is said to have composed works 'On the sacred books in Babylon' and a 'Chaldaean Logos'; Diels 55 A 33, B 298 b; B 299.

[129] Diels 55 B 300, 12–15.

[130] Cf. R. Heinze, Tertullians Apologeticum. Ber. sächs. Akad. (1909), 408 ff.

[131] Plin. n. h. VII, 55, 189, 'reviviscendi promissa Democrito vanitas' can hardly be applied to Democritus' genuine work περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἅϊδου (Diels 55 B 1), but seems to refer to a passage of one of his alleged magic treatises; Zeller I⁴, 810, 3.

ıd the magic practices of his legendary counterfeit, seems to ıave inspired Lactantius to confront him, and his partisans, ‘ith necromancers, and to have refuted him by obvious vidence.

Thus we should possess an accurate analogy to the situation escribed in Clearchus' book on sleep. The Jewish ‘sage from ıe Orient’ had to convert the Occidental unbelievers from ıeir skepticism by an experiment which the Peripatetics, as hampions of the rule: *σῴζειν τὰ φαινόμενα* were forbidden to sist. It testifies to the power with which the true Aristotle d the Greek philosophy of his time, from the steep path of anscendental fancy, back into the wide plain of the perception f reality, that even a mind as dim as that of Clearchus offered p its unconscious tribute to the new empirical science. The ays of victorious empiricism even penetrated the vaporous atıosphere of miraculous demonology. In the place of mythology elying on the internal evidence of its inexplorable pronouncenents, and careless of the content of reality in its hypersensitive nowledge,[132] there stands cognition based upon immediate bservation. *Οὐκέτι πρόβλημά ἐστιν· ὤφθη γὰρ φανερῶς.*[133]

[132] *Μυθολογῶν ὡς ποιητής, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀποδεικνὺς ὡς ἐπιστήμων*, Colotes the Epicurean ı Plato's myths, see Proclus in Plat. rempubl. II, 105, 25 sq., Kroll.

[133] From Aristotle's work on the rise of the Nile, quoted by Photius; see Jaeger, 31, 2.

ARMAGEDDON

CHARLES C. TORREY
Yale University

The term "Armageddon," familiar in English literature, primarily designates the scene of the last great battle at the end of the present age, in which the powers of evil, represented by hostile nations warring against the Kingdom of God, are to be overthrown and destroyed. The name is derived from a passage in the Book of Revelation, 16: 16, in which a standing feature of Hebrew eschatology is given a setting characteristic of the Apocalypse.

The writer sees in his vision three devils in the form of frogs, (vss. 13 f.) "which go forth unto the kings of the whole world, to gather them together unto the war of the great day of God, the Almighty"; (vs. 16) *καὶ συνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν τόπον καλούμενον Ἑβραϊστὶ Ἀρ μαγεδών*: "and they gathered them together unto the place which is called in Hebrew *Har Magedōn*."

Here is a strange-sounding name, where we should have expected Old Testament terminology. The fact of transliteration would seem to indicate that the Greek writer himself had his doubts, and wished to play safe. The word "Hebrew," *Ἑβραϊστί*, may according to circumstances mean either Hebrew or Aramaic, but here there is no reason to hesitate between the two. The division of *αρμαγεδων* into two words is required by the Semitic triliteral root-structure, and the former word in the compound must be *ἄρ*, הַר, "mountain," as has generally been recognized. This is only Hebrew, not Aramaic.

The difficulty comes with the second member of the compound, for at first sight *μαγεδων* suggests no Hebrew word, and the "mountain" seems to give no help. The whole phrase is a geographical designation of some sort, and the scene of the great conflict is somewhere in the holy land, these things are sure; the term before us, however, may not be a simple place-name, for the geography of an apocalypse is not always satisfied by our maps. The Book of Revelation is a storehouse of the Jewish mythology of its time, and it makes some use of veiled allusions.

The interpretation which is now current in English-speaking lands is in fact very ancient. It was initiated by certain copyists or editors of the Greek text who wrote the word with a double *delta*, thus making it correspond to the LXX Μαγεδδω, the usual transliteration of the Hebrew מְגִדּוֹ, Megiddo, the well-known city on the southern border of the Great Plain. The King James version of the English Bible inherited this later spelling of the word in Rev. 16: 16; hence the long-familiar term *Armageddon*, ordinarily understood to have meant originally "the mountain (or "mountain-land") of Megiddo," and proverbially employed to characterize any overwhelming or final victory. We have recently seen the tropical use and the geographical interpretation brought together in a popular terminology derived from an episode in the great war, inasmuch as the British general who overwhelmed the Turkish army on the plain of Esdraelon was thereafter called "Allenby of Megiddo" and "Allenby of Armageddon."

The two geographical terms have in fact become associated, even in some learned use, to the extent of making them completely synonymous. In a recent popularly written but authoritative volume dealing with excavations in the Near East the popular equation is accepted, and we see in the Table of Contents "The Megiddo (Armageddon) Expedition." Here it might be thought that the name of the city is used in a wider sense, to include the whole adjoining region. That this is not the case is shown by a figure in the text, a photograph of Tell el-Mutesellim, under which we read: "The Palestinian Mound Covering the Fortress City of Megiddo (Armageddon) now being Excavated." Once more, in the Index: "Megiddo (Armageddon, modern Tell el-Mutesellim)," again expressly giving the city-mound the apocalyptic name. This is insisting on an identity which in the nature of the case can only be fanciful. The city itself could never have been called "*the Mountain* of Megiddo" (!); what, then, is the signification of the prefixed *har*?

There is a more important question to be answered. Can Megiddo have been intended at all in Rev. 16: 16? What is named is a mountain, or a mountainous region, and this does

ɔt in the least suit the identification. Megiddo lies at the edge
f the Great Plain, and wherever in the Old Testament the
ɟion of Megiddo is mentioned, it is always the enormous and
w-lying field that is in mind. Twice occurs the phrase, "the
oad valley (בקעה) of Megiddo" (Zech. 12: 11; 2 Chron. 35: 22).
the popular work above mentioned, the photograph of the
ɔund shows no hills in the neighborhood, and on one page we
ad: "We could see the impressive mound a few miles away
ross the plain. . . . We have had opportunity for studying
. the scene of so many dramatic struggles between the na-
ɔns that it has become proverbial as 'Armageddon.'" *The*
ole plain, then, was Armageddon? what has become of the
ɔuntains?

The earliest Christian interpreters, including Origen and
rome, did not think of μαγεδων as the name of a place, but
essed (rather wildly) at its meaning, proposing this or that
-fetched etymology. "Megiddo" was eventually adopted by
arly all commentators, not merely because of the exact corre-
ondence of the later spelling of the apocalyptic word with the
eek place-name, but also because of the fact, made much of,
at many important battles had been fought in that neighbor-
od. The region was a battlefield, however, because it was a
st open valley, unobstructed by hills. Origen, Eusebius, and
rome could have told our modern scholars that the phrase
ountain of Megiddo" was not only unheard of but intrinsi-
ly impossible.

Accordingly, the textbooks of the present day, after accepting
Megiddo" with hesitation, proceed to express their dissatis-
tion and to record various more or less improbable con-
tures. The principal attempts at explanation are listed by
stle, article "Har-Magedon," in Hastings' Dictionary of the
ɔle; by Cheyne, article "Armageddon" in the Encyclopaedia
ɔlica; and by R. H. Charles, The Revelation of St. John, II,
f. (In each of these three summaries, it may be observed, the
ɔblem is regarded as unsolved, and the solution is believed to
somewhere in the language of Hebrew eschatology.) Those
o still hold to Megiddo point to the fact that its neighbor-
ɔd was the scene of two momentous events in Israelite his-

tory: the defeat of the Canaanites by Barak and Deborah, as narrated in the 5th chapter of Judges; and the defeat and death of Josiah, 2 Chron. 35: 22–25. Would not the famous battle-ground be the natural place for the coming conflict? To this, many scholars have replied, that the incidents are too remote to give the Great Plain a foremost place, or any place, in the picture of the Last Days. The decisive argument, however, is found in the fact that the locality of the final struggle is already designated, definitely and uniformly, in Hebrew eschatology. The great battle is to be fought in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem, as the Hebrew-Jewish scriptures, of whatever date, say with one voice. The hostile armies make war on the holy city as well as on the people of God; they come up against Jerusalem and lay siege to it. Whatever the notions (and they were various) as to the progress of the struggle, and its duration, there was never the slightest uncertainty as to the place where it was to be enacted. This has not been generally realized, and it may be well to quote the most important passages *in extenso* instead of giving mere references.

The predictions in the Book of Zechariah offer a good starting-point. Chap. 14: 1 ff. uses plain words, and its program contains some special features which do not happen to appear elsewhere in the Old Testament. "Behold, a day of Yahweh comes, when thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee. [2] For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle, and the city shall be taken. . . . Half of the city shall go forth into captivity, but the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city. [3] Then shall Yahweh go forth and fight against those nations; . . . [4] and his feet shall stand in that day on the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east; and the Mount of Olives shall be cleft in the midst," and there will be "a very great valley" running east and west.

According to this representation the city will be twice besieged by "all the nations," and the first attack will succeed, though the city will not be destroyed. After an interval, in the second siege the enemy will be annihilated.

Similarly Ezekiel, in his vision concerning Gog and Magog, prophesies that these marvellous hordes will in the last day

come up "upon the mountains of Israel" (39: 2, 4, 17), where they will then meet their doom. Their fallen hosts will be buried east of Jerusalem, in a great valley lying in the direction of the Dead Sea (the text of 39: 11 is corrupt, and apparently has been tampered with, but this seems to be its meaning).

In Zech. 12 (an especially obscure chapter) we read of "the siege of Jerusalem" (vs. 2); "all the nations of the earth gathered together against it" (vs. 3). "In that day I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem" (vs. 9). Rev. 1: 7 quotes verbally from the Hebrew of this chapter.

The picture given in Joel 4: 1–14 is especially familiar. "Behold, in those days I will gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and I will strive against them there for my people. . . . [9] Proclaim ye this among the nations; prepare war; stir up the mighty men. . . . [12] Let the nations bestir themselves and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat, for there will I sit to judge all the nations round about. [13] Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe; come, tread ye, for the winepress is full and the vats overflow; for their wickedness is great. [14] Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision! for the day of Yahweh is near in the valley of decision."

The prophet may have had in mind no particular locality, in coining the term "valley of Jehoshaphat," but he certainly thought of the vicinity of Jerusalem. The way in which this passage is used in the Book of Revelation will be mentioned presently.

Phrases from the dramatic little scene in Is. 29: 1–7 deserve to be included. "Ho Ariel, Ariel, the city where David encamped! I will raise siege works against thee, and thou shalt be brought low. But the multitude of thy foes shall be like small dust, and the multitude of the terrible ones as chaff that passeth away. The multitude of all the nations that fight against Ariel, even all that fight against her and her stronghold, and that distress her, shall be as a dream, a vision of the night."

The testimony of 4 Ezra is interesting, in that it comes from an apocalypse whose date is approximately that of the Book of Revelation. The passage 13: 1–38 describes the great battle

of the peoples in language so definite as to leave no doubt about the location. The seer is shown a man coming up out of the sea, who then rides on the clouds of heaven (vs. 3). Against him gathers an innumerable multitude of men to make war (vs. 5). He sends down fire (cf. Ezekiel 38: 22, Rev. 20: 9) and it consumes them (vss. 10 f.). Then follows the interpretation of the vision, and we read: "[33] It shall be, when all the nations hear his (the Messiah's) voice, every man shall leave his own land and the warfare which they have one against another; [34] and an innumerable multitude shall be gathered together, as thou didst see, desiring to come and fight against him. [35] *But he shall stand upon the summit of Mount Zion. . . .* [38] And then shall he destroy them without labor by the Law, which is likened unto fire."

In view of all this, it would be very surprising if the writer of the Book of Revelation should represent the overthrow of the hosts of wickedness as taking place anywhere else than in the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem. Apocalyptic tradition is of necessity singularly constant. We find, indeed, in the Book of Revelation no contradiction of accepted views, where the statements of the book are clear. In the passage 14: 14–20 the wrath and slaughter of the Great Day are announced in the familiar imagery. The Son of Man comes in the clouds of heaven, and the angel with the sharp sickle is bidden to go down and do his terrible work. "[19] And the angel sent his sickle into the earth, and gathered the vintage of the earth and cast it into the great winepress of the wrath of God. [20] And the winepress was trodden *without the city*, and there came out blood from the winepress, even unto the bridles of the horses, as far as a thousand and six hundred furlongs." Here are the very words of Joel 4: 13, from the passage quoted above; and we could be certain, even without the ἔξωθεν τῆς πόλεως, that the "valley of Jehoshaphat" was in the vision of the writer as the focal point of the final clash with the armies of the Gentile world. Furthermore, in 20: 7–10 the apocalyptist reproduces, for his own panorama of the last days, the vision of Ezekiel concerning Gog and Magog. The scene is precisely the same as in all the other passages. "[7] And when the thousand years are finished, Satan

hall be loosed out of his prison [8] and shall come forth to deceive he nations which are in the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to war (*συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς ὸν πόλεμον*); the number of whom is as the sand of the sea (cf. Ezek. 38: 9, 16). [9] And they shall come up over the breadth f the land, *and shall compass the camp of the saints about, and he beloved city.* And fire shall come down out of heaven and evour them (Ezek. 38: 22)."

It is therefore quite certain that the writer of this book does ot break with Jewish tradition in regard to the two tremendous attles in which the evil of the world is to be removed from it by word and fire. *Both battles*, he says in unequivocal terms, *are o be fought on the mountains around Jerusalem*, and the powers f heaven will gain their victory just outside the city. The one hing which has seemed to many to run counter to this conclusion is the Hebrew-Greek term in 16: 16 interpreted as containing the name "Megiddo." It is now clear that our problem must be solved without reference to that city or its vicinity. The faithful in Judea and Jerusalem are to witness the final manifestation of Yahweh's might. The Plain of Esdraelon, two days' journey to the north, is utterly out of the picture. *Whatever "Armageddon" may mean, it has nothing to do with Megiddo.*

To this conclusion exegetes in ever-increasing number have been driven. Back of the problematic *Har Magedon* must lie a literary or cryptic term of some sort designating the vicinity of Jerusalem. With this seen as the only possibility, there have been several attempts at explanation, one of them falling only a little short of complete success.

The author of an anonymous article published in the Zeitschr. ür die alttest. Wissenschaft, Vol. VII (1887), offered a solution based on the supposition of an original Hebrew text which was misunderstood. He suggested (p. 170) that the phrase which he Greek translator interpreted as הַר מְגִדּוֹ, "mountain of Megiddo," was intended by the author of the apocalypse to be read as הַר מִגְדּוֹ, *har migdō*, "his fruitful mountain"; meaning he mountain land which included the region of Jerusalem. ubsequent writers mention this proposal, but without accepting it. The noun מגר is rare in the Old Testament, and occurs

there in the plural only. The supposedly well-known Hebrew(!) name of the region is ill-suited to this particular context.

Gunkel, in his Schöpfung und Chaos, presented a characteristic hypothesis which received the support of Zimmern and Jensen. He compared the dragon of the Apocalypse with Tiāmat, thought that some *Babylonian* myth must be referred to in Rev. 16: 16, and suggested that μαγεδων may be connected with a name found in certain Greek magic texts which contain Babylonian material. This name is Ὑεσεμ[μ]ιγαδων, the name of the husband of Ἐρεσχιγαλ, a Babylonian goddess of the underworld. The argument for the identification is concisely put by Cheyne in the Encycl. Bibl., article "Armageddon," col. 311: "It would be natural that the spot where Tiāmat was defeated (and was again to be defeated) by Marduk should be called by a name which included that of a god of the underworld." The fact that this conjecture is recorded in several textbooks shows to what straits interpreters have been reduced; but it could be swallowed only by a Pan-Babylonian in his hungry moments.

A far more promising approach was made in the field of *Hebrew* mythology. As soon as *Har Magedōn* was cut loose from Megiddo and the need of a new interpretation was felt, another strange geographical phrase, *Har Mō'ēdh*, was sure to suggest itself to readers of the Hebrew Bible. It occurs but once, namely in Is. 14: 13, in the fine poem on the death of the mighty conqueror (Alexander the Great?) who had shaken the world to its foundations as no other tyrant had ever shaken it. The verse reads: "Thou saidst in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the divine stars; and I will sit *on the Mount of Assembly in the recesses of the north*" (בְּהַר מוֹעֵד בְּיַרְכְּתֵי צָפוֹן). Here is a strikingly interesting bit of popular mythology of heathen origin, used as a literary property by a Hebrew poet. Might not the two mysterious "mountains" be one and the same?

Nestle, in the article "Harmagedon" in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, notes that Hommel conjectured הר מועד as the original reading from which the Greek phrase in Rev. 16: 16 was derived, publishing his conjecture in the Neue kirkliche Zeitschrift, Vol. VI (1890), 407 f. He supposed that the author

the Apocalypse wrote μανέδ or μωέδ, which later was corcted or corrupted into μαγεδών. Hommel's suggestion aroused me interest. Siegfried, in a review of the Handwörterbuch of esenius-Buhl, published in the Theol. Lit.-Zeitung, 1895, l. 304, remarked incidentally that in "Harmagedon" the ebrew phrase of Is. 14: 13 seems to have been confused with legiddo; and he referred to E. von Starck's Palästina und yrien as expressing the same opinion.

The conjecture bore no fruit, however, for there seemed to be o way of carrying it further. The distance between μωηδ and ιγεδων is hardly negligible; and it was not clear why the frogemons should assemble the great armies of the world at the orth Pole, or wherever the Semitic Olympus might be located, r an attack on the Jews of Jerusalem. As to the former of ese two objections, Nestle himself (l. c.) remarked, acutely ough, that under certain circumstances the consonant *'ain* n be represented by the Greek *gamma*; but he was unable to ake any use of the suggestion.

Now it has been recognized by many modern exegetes that e "Mount of Assembly," originally the rendezvous of pagan ities, was taken over by the Hebrews into their own religious rminology — like so many other bits of foreign mythology. vidence of this is found in Ps. 48, where occurs the singular rase, "Mount Zion *in the recesses of the north*." Three conderations made it very natural that the mythical *Har Mō'ēdh* ould be transferred to Jerusalem.

1. Yahweh was supreme over all the "gods," and any assemage of them was at his call and command (Is. 40: 26, Ps. 103:)). These divine beings, represented by the heavenly bodies, e termed "gods," אלהים, in Ps. 82, אֵלִים in 58: 2; "sons of od," Gen. 6: 2, Ps. 29: 1, 89: 7 f., Deut. 32: 8 (cf. LXX); see so Deut. 4: 19, 29: 25, Sirach 17: 17, etc.

2. "Yahweh's *holy mountain*" had long been a standing and ry common phrase. In the time of the patriarchs and Moses e mountain was Sinai, in all the later time it was Mount ion. In comparison with Sinai, Jerusalem could be spoken of ; "in the recesses of the north"; so the interpreter of the phrase uld reason — if it were necessary to reason at all.

3. The use of מֹעֵד, *mō'ēdh*, in the religious terminology was perhaps the strongest reason for the adoption of the mythological term. It was a designation of the temple at Jerusalem; Ps. 74: 4, Lam. 2: 6. *Ohel mō'ēdh*, the "Tent of Meeting" of God with his people, is a standing feature in the Hebrew Bible from the Pentateuch to Chronicles. This latter term, especially, could not fail to attract to itself the "Mount of Meeting," which thus became synonymous with הַר צִיּוֹן. In Hebrew eschatology Jerusalem was the center of all the predicted gatherings, whether of the people of God or of the heathen nations.

In Ps. 48: 3–9 the psalmist takes his stand, in imagination, at that point in the world's history where the poets and prophets of Israel especially loved to post themselves, the day of the final vindication. He sees the assembling of the Gentile kings and armies, and their overthrow; and then cries out in exultation (cf. Is. 25: 9 f., where מואב is recognized as a misreading of אויב): It has all happened just as we had been told! When the poet speaks of the mountain of God as "beautiful in its elevation," he has in mind that miracle of the Messianic Age which is described in Is. 2: 2, Micah 4: 1, and Zech. 14: 10.

The passage, Ps. 48: 3 ff., reads as follows: "[3] Beautiful in its elevation, the joy of the whole earth, is *Mount Zion in the recesses of the north*, the city of the Great King. [4] In its palaces God has shown himself a tower of strength. [5] For, behold, the kings *assembled themselves* (נוֹעֲדוּ); all at once they disappeared. . . . [8] They were as when the east wind shatters ships of Tarshish. [9] As we have heard, so have we seen it, in the city of the Lord of Hosts, the city of our God!"

The allusion here to the mythological term in Is. 14: 13 is universally recognized and beyond question; the psalmist in his description of the "armageddon" employs both the הַר and the מוֹעֵד; and it certainly is a legitimate conclusion, that in Hebrew-Jewish eschatology הַר מוֹעֵד, "Mount of Assembly," was a standing term for the scene of the great battle of the Messianic time. This gives a new point of view from which to approach the transliterated Hebrew phrase, ἂρ μαγεδών, in Rev. 16: 16.

Here enters the problem of the original language of the New

'estament Apocalypse, for the question concerns the proceed-
ıg of the Greek writer in his transliteration. Was the term
/hich he wrote already familiar to him in Greek? Was it
nown to him in its original Hebrew? Was he free to compose
is own Greek text, or was he rendering a Semitic document
/hich lay before him in Semitic characters?

There is here no space for discussing the general question, but
ertain conclusions may be stated which will be demonstrated
ı another place. The language of the present book is as obvi-
us and certain a specimen of translation Greek as can be found
nywhere, and it has the same character in all parts of the book.
he Greek translation follows the original closely, making it
ossible to determine with certainty which Semitic language
as employed. The interpreter did his difficult work excel-
ently, and mistranslations are not numerous. One particularly
nteresting specimen may be mentioned here: When the Messiah
ides forth on the white horse, at the head of the armies of
eaven in their pure white uniform (Rev. 19: 11–16), his title,
King of Kings and Lord of Lords, is written "on his gar-
nent and on his *banner*" (דגל), not "on his garment and on
is *leg*" (רגל). The translator's ἐπὶ τὸν μηρὸν αὐτοῦ was a
trictly accurate rendering, but it rendered the wrong word.

The geographical term in 16: 16 was written thus: הרמעד. The
riefer orthography, without the vowel-letter, was customary;
hus, for example, the more usual way of writing "Caesar,"
Καισαρ, was קסר, not קיסר. The translator, seeing the designa-
ion of a place or region, could not fail to interpret correctly
he הַר (mountain); but he certainly did *not* recognize the מעד
which followed, and therefore was obliged to transliterate.
This gave at once and almost inevitably the Greek reading
ιρμαγεδ.

Whoever rendered this Apocalypse into Greek had strong
eason to deal faithfully with every letter of it; see 22: 19! The
nly Greek consonant which could represent the Hebrew ע is γ;
nd it was much used in transliteration, without regard to the
uestion of etymology, as is now well known. Indeed, it was
specially likely to be employed in cases where the interpreter
lid not know the meaning of the word before him. Thus in

1 Chron. 4:9 the cautious translator Theodotion renders the problematic עבץ (the result of text-corruption) by γαβης; in 2:47, 49 שַׁעַף by Σαγαφ; in 1 Sam. 9:4 the Lagarde text has Σεγαλειμ for שְׁעָלִים, etc. It is not necessary to multiply illustrations. The *gamma* in μαγεδ certainly represents the Hebrew guttural. The choice of the vowel ε for the second syllable may have been made simply for the sake of variety; but it seems more likely that it was occasioned by familiarity with the name Μαγεδδω(ν), which occurs a dozen times in the Greek Bible. For the same reason, the very first scribes of the Greek text would be expected to build out the unfamiliar and seemingly abbreviated *nomen loci* into a form resembling the name of the famous city. Hence, probably, the -ων.

The way in which the strange phrase in 16:16 came into being is perhaps now sufficiently demonstrated, since the fact of importance, its meaning, has been made clear. Whether we can fully explain every step in the process or not, Αρμαγεδων certainly originated in the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew literary term which was not understood. The phrase was in fact an occult designation of the battle-ground, the holy mountains about Jerusalem; on which, according to the author of this Apocalypse as well as to every other exponent of Jewish eschatology, the hosts of heaven were destined to overthrow the heathen armies at the end of the present age.

DDITIONAL PARALLELS TO THE RENDING OF THE VEIL IN MELITO'S HOMILY ON THE PASSION

MARTIN RIST

THE ILIFF SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

HIS recent article on "Two Problems in Melito's Homily on the ssion" Professor Bonner quoted a number of striking parallels to elito's version of the rending of the temple veil at the time of the ucifixion. In tracing the ultimate origin of the portents accompanyg the crucifixion he cited, among others, Josephus' account of the nens that foreshadowed the fall of Jerusalem, particularly the voice the temple saying, "Let us go hence." For, as he observed, both ts of phenomena indicate that God in his divine displeasure was out to leave his sanctuary. An additional illustration from a Jewish urce contemporaneous with the development of the gospel tradition provided by the Apocalypse of Baruch (or II Baruch) vi–viii (cf. (xx).[1]

Although the apocalyptist is actually describing phenomena that eceded the destruction of the temple by the Romans, he remains ithful to his pseudonym by setting the scene in the days of Jereiah when God, angered by the sins of his people, had sent the haldees to take the Jews captive. Accordingly, Baruch relates that e was lifted up above the walls of the beleaguered city by a strong irit. He describes his vision as follows:

> And I beheld, and lo! four angels standing at the four corners of the city, ch of them holding a torch of fire in his hands. And another angel began to scend from heaven, and said unto them: "Hold your lamps, and do not ght them till I tell you. For I am first sent to speak a word to the earth, and place in it what the Lord Most High has commanded me." And I saw him scend into the Holy of Holies, and take from thence the veil, and the holy k, and the mercy-seat, and the two tables, and the holy raiment of the iests, and the altar of incense, and the forty-eight precious stones, wherewith the priest was adorned, and all the holy vessels of the tabernacle.

At the command of the angel the earth opened up to receive the cred objects which he had taken from the temple. Thereupon he rdered the four angels with torches to overthrow the wall to its undations, lest the victors should boast that they had destroyed he wall of Zion. When this had been accomplished, a voice from the

[1] For a different viewpoint cf. McCasland, "Portents in Josephus and in the Gosels," Journal of Biblical Literature LI (1932), 323–335.

interior of the temple was heard to say, "Enter, ye enemies, and come, ye adversaries: for he who kept the house has deserted (it)."

This description contains striking variations from the account in Josephus: notably, the introduction of angelology and the removal of the veil and the rest of the furnishings from the Holy of Holies by an angel. Moreover, these additional items give further weight to the belief that the Christian tradition of the portents at the time of the crucifixion was strongly influenced by Jewish accounts of those that presaged the fall of Jerusalem. The entire passage is closely paralleled in Pesikta R. 26; less closely in the Rest of the Words of Baruch. In the latter work Jeremiah, and not the angel, removes the sacred articles from the temple, a deviation which may be a reflection of II Maccabees ii. 4–8.

Even more relevant, perhaps, is a passage from chapter x of a homily on the assumption of the Virgin attributed to Evodius. Certain virgins who ministered in the temple give their account of the crucifixion phenomena (according to James' rendering of the Bohairic text): [2]

> When we saw the darkness at the crucifixion we fled into the holy of holies and shut the door. We saw a strong angel come down with a sword, and he rent the veil in twain: and we heard a great voice (from the house of the altar *Sah.*), saying, Woe to thee, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets. The angel of the altar flew up into the canopy of the altar with the angel of the sword; and we knew that God had left his people, and we fled to his Mother.

This narrative contains a number of interesting data: the setting is the Holy of Holies; the veil is rent by an angel with a sword; a voice is heard; there is an angel of the altar who leaves his dwelling place; and the explicit statement is made that these signs indicate that God has left his people.

Of less significance, but interesting for its angelology, is the description in the Slavonic version of the Gospel (or Questions) of Bartholomew, i. 25–27. During the crucifixion an angel of vengeance came down from the Father's throne to destroy all the powers of the world. When Jesus commanded him to ascend, "there went a flame out of his hand and rent asunder the veil of the temple, and parted it in two pieces for a witness unto the children of Israel." [3] It will be noted that these examples add nothing but further confirmation to the views advanced by Professor Bonner.

[2] The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford, 1924), p. 195.

[3] Ibid., p. 169.